PRISM

AN ANGLICAN MONTHLY

July 1961 Vol. V No. 7 1s. 6d.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

SCHOOLS

PRISM

32 BLOOMSBURY STREET

LONDON, W.C.1

Telephone: MUSeum 3855

Editor

TIMOTHY BEAUMONT

Editorial Advisory Committee

DONALD ALLCHIN

ROBIN DENNISTON

CHRISTOPHER MARTIN

ROBIN MINNEY

NICHOLAS MOSLEY

Subscription rates (*post free*):

3 months, 5s.

6 months, 10s.

12 months, 20s.

Prism can be obtained at Church bookshops

THIS MONTH

		Page
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS	H. W. Marratt	1
SUNDAY SCHOOLS	A Parish Committee	5
THE APPROVED SCHOOL	Leslie Paul	17
YOUR GOD IS TOO BIG	David Nicholls	21
EICHMANN, ISRAEL AND THE C.N.D.	H. Palmer	25
MORAL RE-ARMAMENT	John Wilkinson	29
COMMENT		33
LETTERS		39
POETRY	K. Connolly, David Mitchell Frank Buchanan, Helen Grundy Myra Kendrick	51
REVIEWS	W. H. Allchin, T.W.B. Peter Coleman, Elizabeth Dupré	55
PRAYER (6): INTERCESSION	Sister Edna Mary, C.S.A.	61

Religious Education in Secondary Schools

H. W. Marratt

Religious Education in State Schools is a frequent target for the uninformed, or for those who are bound to the Prayer Book. This article attempts to describe what happens in one Grammar School; from experience and conversation with other Divinity specialists I would regard it as fairly typical.

The limitations in a State School are immediately obvious. An often mentioned one is that the teaching cannot be openly directed towards committing pupils to a Christian way of life; any attempt to "indoctrinate" them is against the spirit of the 1944 Act, and in any case defeats its object since it is instinctively detected, resented and thwarted. But this disadvantage has an obverse merit which many Church schools lack: for if the pupils do not come from or study in a completely Christian environment, at any rate they represent all views and none, and so present an unequalled opportunity for instruction in the nature of the Gospel. Provided that an atmosphere of free discussion prevails, in my experience they are willing to learn and often to commit themselves. A more serious weakness is the few periods (usually one per week, except for G.C.E. candidates) which can be allotted to Divinity, with the result that the fifth-former (without Sunday School training) is often almost at the third-form stage in content of knowledge compared with his scientific subjects; in addition a subject with fewer periods starts off at a psychological disadvantage.

Considering first the academic content of a Divinity syllabus I think the main difficulty is to achieve the right balance between the various aspects of religious education—and, in a school which draws from a variety of Primary Schools, to know what basic knowledge to assume. In my present school we aim to give our basic knowledge of the history of Israel, the life of Christ and the Acts of the Apostles in the first two years. The third year is spent using the Biblical knowledge in order to study the character of God revealed in the Bible and its implications for human behaviour.

Boys about to leave school, with whom I have discussed the question, welcome the idea of moral guidance provided that it is not pious clap-trap, but are quite definite that it must come in third or fourth years; I find it quite easy when studying the Fatherhood or Justice or Love of God to discuss all kinds of problems of domestic, schoolboy or social ethics which are naturally raised by the boys themselves.

We purposely postpone the study of Church history until the fourth year, by which time all boys have studied up to and beyond the Reformation in history lessons; this also avoids the need for a full chronological approach (and anyhow 2,000 years in one period per week is impossible) which is not desirable if Divinity is not to be just another history period. In the fifth year we study Christian Apologetics; admittedly this would often be tackled more intelligently by sixth-formers, but two considerations seem to me to favour a fifth year treatment: first, boys at that age want to discuss the problems of the Christian faith and I consider it better to do so intentionally rather than via red-herrings in the course of studying the life of Christ, as happened in one school where I taught. A second factor is that they enjoy more informal discussion at a time when all other lessons are devoted to G.C.E. cramming. For want of any other agreed basis, we use the Apostles' Creed; this sometimes startles visitors (though I can never understand why), but there is nothing against it in the Act, and with the right treatment it provides a historical and doctrinal framework for a modern approach. The sixth form continues to discuss Christian Apologetics intentionally and unintentionally (!) for its two or three years, but here the approach varies from Marxist materialism or Freud to Comparative Religion. Many Christian educationalists, remembering the academic interest in other religions in their own student days, probably do not realise how much more real is the attraction of Eastern religions to the modern pupil and student who may live or study next to an overseas national. I frequently hear Christian apologists make the ever-necessary defence of religion against humanism and then fail entirely to specify which religion. One cannot assume that a sixth-former will tacitly accept Christianity as the sole true religion, for many of them, brought up to the sounds of political co-existence, prefer to think in terms of an amalgam of Religions. The unique character of Christianity must be presented against a background of world religions, as well as of cosmic science, if it is to answer their problems. A similar complex problem is the desirability of giving

an intelligent sixth-former a modern adult scholarly approach to the Bible; in theory this should be within the grasp of any sixth-form, but by that time the religious may have hardened into "liberals" and "fundamentalists" so that the uncommitted majority in the class are only further put off by their acrimonious exchanges. Biblical teaching can be done however, without falling into this trap, but there is not space to deal with the subject here.

So much for some of the academic problems in religious education. Far more serious in my opinion are its ecclesiastical ones. The answer to the critic who argues that State religious education is "watered-down" Christianity is that any weakness in the fundamental conception of religious education is due to the divisions of the Church —"parsons in glass houses should not throw stones..." But until the day of more official agreement comes, some of us are determined to bridge the gap between School and Church, so that for those who want it the academic study of Christianity and the classroom faith may be related to and expressed in a worshipping community. After all Christianity without worship is almost like Science teaching without laboratory experiments. School Assembly provides some experience in worship, but it is artificial, temporary and not always satisfying or encouraging. But then neither is there much satisfying relevance for modern youth in many church services; I argue fiercely in class against boys' stupidity in condemning all church worship because they were bored at occasional scout (or cub) parades, but one wonders how many clergymen realise the permanent damage they do to the future of the Church by failing to make church worship intelligible and relevant to youth.

My own conviction is that the main way to overcome the Church-School gap is to bring the local clergy and ministers into the schools, since for teenagers who never enter a church they are the Church. Recently with the full approval and support of my headmaster I approached the local Council of Churches, and held a meeting with some of the clergy and ministers. We had a full discussion of our relations, and they gave full approval to my scheme to invite clergy and ministers to come into the classroom in lesson-time, without any stipulations about keeping to "denominational ratios". I can now invite the best man for the job, irrespective of denomination, with their complete goodwill, and boys are through this means being brought into touch with the local churches. I also found them willing for me to take a party of boys to a normal service so that it could

be discussed in class afterwards. This activity may be considered too "clinical" and it has obvious dangers, but in a scientific age it is a necessary approach which appeals to a boy who never attends a church service or is bored by it. I cannot report on the scheme yet, because it has only just begun to operate, but I can say there is no resentment of these clerical visits, and no inhibitions so far. This year, with adjustments in the timetable readily granted by the headmaster, I hope to invite local ministers to talk about their own denominations to all the fourth year classes, and so avoid my treating Church history in abstract, apart from my own denomination. In this way the subject should gain local relevance. Provided that the local churches are fundamentally at one in their concern for the integration of boys into some worshipping community, I feel that in spite of all its shortcomings and dangers this scheme must benefit both boys and churches.

Indeed the great weakness of State Religious Education in the eyes of some of its critics—its lack of church attachment—seems to me to provide a great opportunity for an ecumenical approach to Christianity, which will help both those who are committed to a church and those who are not, and in the long run will help to draw together the local churches themselves, when the present scholars have become leaders in those churches.

Contributors

H. W. Marratt is Senior Divinity Master at Battersea Grammar School.

Leslie Paul is the original angry young man. He is the author of an important book, *Son of Man*, to be published by Hodder & Stoughton in September and has also written a number of books of a religious and philosophical nature.

David Nicholls is Research Fellow at Kings College, Cambridge, and is now working on a thesis about Neville Figgis at Yale.

John Wilkinson is on the staff of the newly-formed Theological College in Jerusalem.

A Report on the Re-organisation of Sunday-School Work in an Ordinary Parish Compiled by A Number of Parishioners under the Chairmanship of the Vicar

INTRODUCTION.

This report was prompted by an article on "The Parish Church and the Teen-ager" by the Vicar of St. Barnabas, Morcambe in November, 1959. The closing words were "Let any group of intelligent people of not too great age discuss the matter. . . ."

Two weekly meetings of different groups of people began in December. These continued to draw about thirty people until Whitsun and then only one group carried on. About a dozen or so carried on the whole year. These were all between 35-45 years old. One or two worked in the local shops or offices, some were housewives, one was a widow, one man sold fish, another was an electrical engineer, and another a labourer. None had had a grammar school education.

Besides these meetings the vicar consulted other groups in the district, C.E.M.S., Mothers' Union, Deanery Chapters and the like. Many people were consulted privately or by correspondence. Clergy, teachers, probation officers, policemen, parents and shopkeepers, Christian or otherwise, their comments and observations were requested. Diocesan experts were asked for help and advice, and at least three training college principals or chaplains were consulted.

Regarding the Views of the people consulted.

We found that the people we thought were most involved in the matter, namely the parish clergy, were too occupied to contemplate radical changes. On the whole they preferred to defend the status quo as the best of all possible worlds, and were certainly not prepared to judge the system (of Sunday-Schools) by "its failures rather than its so-called successes".

The diocesan experts seemed too pre-occupied with their own activities and schemes to help very much. This is not a personal

criticism. Perhaps if we had met them at all personally we would say "They were too busy". We wanted detached and expert criticism of our own thoughts. We hoped for wise guidance and information about other efforts to face the same problem. This was not forthcoming. In passing we would like to say that diocesan experts should not be too busy. Are they in their position to help the parishes, or is it rather that the parishes help them to work out schemes and experiments.?

Our approach required the detached criticism of wise and knowledgable people who were not too involved in the situation. This we did not find anywhere. One person taking up the post of Religious Education Adviser to another diocese actually stated publicly that he had no idea where Sunday-Schools fitted into the pattern of religious education in a diocese. This surprised us. At a diocesan conference the experts asked for ideas from the parish clergy about the vexed question of Sunday-Schools. A Tutor from a Theological College was heard to say at a gathering of clergy that he was there to learn from the parish clergy, not to teach them.

This reference of basic pastoral problems to those who are very busy, too busy to see them in their true perspective, we found very depressing.

Laymen on the whole were conservative, unimaginative, and constantly reflecting on the wondrous things that happened in their day and in the old times before them. "You and I, Vicar, have different opinions on Sunday-Schools, and I'm not going to change mine", said one who had been a superintendent for thirty odd years.

Probation officers thought the idea of training adults to influence children deliberately but indirectly was a first-class idea but could not go into details as to how they could be trained or by whom.

Professional educationalists such as tutors in training colleges regarded the church as having been "An adult education department for at least a thousand years or so. . . and until the last few years took the kids in its stride, didn't it", to quote one of them.

THE DISCUSSIONS.

Thus in the main we had to struggle along dealing with the matter at a parochial level as best we could. It was a good thing that our church hall was demolished to make way for a new building. This meant that the curate could take the whole Sunday School in the church and leave the rest of us free to meet on Sunday afternoons.

For six months or so the basic features of the Christian faith were mulled over to deepen our convictions—as the Vicar put it. This, we were told, was different to increasing our knowledge or information. We did not see the importance of this until it was pointed out months later that people with convictions were perhaps better qualified to teach children in "Sunday-School" than those with knowledge and information about religious matters. This gave many of us more confidence about teaching ourselves although we were not trained teachers in the day school sense. And this was perhaps our first important conclusion.

The teacher must aim at passing on convictions about God, about oneself, and about life in the world and not just religious knowledge. Nor are these convictions conveyed by much knowledge or information. These convictions quite ordinary people can articulate and pass on.

After two months of lectures we began to exchange views and after eight months really serious discussion was started before the Vicar had time to begin. The most telling revelations came out as we honestly referred to our own experiences. For example, it came out at one point that not one of us except perhaps the Vicar actually said daily prayers morning and night. This came out as we discussed the sense or nonsense of rules of life.

After a year or so of this discussion we now find that we would much rather get on with the teaching. We think that many have fallen away from the meetings because of the interminable talk. The Vicar is somewhat dismayed at this for he hardly knows what we are going to do when we begin to teach. At the same time he says he has a greater respect for our intentions than he used to have. What he is afraid of is that we may just fall into the pattern of what we did in our own childhood after a few weeks of enthusiasm. We say it is up to him to prevent this with his preparation classes and the books he provides us with. We set below our considered conclusions drawn together by the Vicar and approved by us all. They have yet to be tested in practice but we are keen to start. The last year has been stimulating and valuable, but under God's guidance we will start to do something ourselves now.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

1. Sunday School, as commonly understood, cannot be any serious influence on the growing children of today, because it has the

children for at the most only an hour a week. If, however, the church is easily recognised in the community as an adult organisation with influence, then there is some point in Sunday-School as a preparation for that adult organisation. Too often the church seems to exist for the sake of the children. In the same way if there is evidence in the home of the importance of the church in adult life the Sunday-School time will not be completely wasted. It might be, otherwise. The childish idea of the church gained in many Sunday-Schools does more harm than good sometimes.

2. The children should at all times see that the church is something they grow up to. The time they take a full part in the affairs of the church should be no sooner than when they take a full part in other organisations in the community. Early confirmation should be accepted only on rare occasions. Children should not be encouraged to run through the whole gamut of religious practice in the first twelve years of their lives and be expected to repeat this faithfully for the last threescore. Family worship and Parish Communion in this respect have not always been the best of influences.

Further, teenagers and young people should not be hastily sought after or encouraged to take up positions of responsibility too early. These will prove irksome and tiresome when the adult pattern of behaviour becomes the centre of their lives. For example, Sunday-School teachers of teen-age have a real problem when they begin courting seriously. Their courting is much too important for them to have to dodge church responsibilities to do it. This keeps them from church later. Let it be obvious that the main body of church people are mature, adult and masculine in their outlook on life and the tone of the Sunday-School will reflect this.

In this same vein the whole attitude to church attendance should be viewed rather pragmatically than dogmatically. Children should be taught to "use the church", rather than to "come to church".

3. Teachers should be adults with Christian convictions. This does not necessarily mean those who are most loyal to the parish church. Those with deep loyalties often have the same because of historical or geographical connections. Loyalty to the locality is often very inarticulate and this is not a good state of mind for a teacher of children. Further there are in a parish many people who wish to have thier children christianly and virtuously brought up but who have no close connections through no fault of their own,

or through faults now admitted. These can be admirable teachers because they are unconditioned.

4. The foundation of the Sunday-School organisation should be a Parents-Teachers Association or something akin to it. If the local education authority can be brought into it all the better. This should meet regularly and act responsibly towards the organisation aiming at closer knowledge of each other and the recognition of a common aim in influencing the growing child.

5. Although the phrase has been used above many times, the title Sunday School should be dropped. In its place, Church School should be used. Teaching should be carried on at all times possible through the week.

6. Children should be grouped as follows:—

(a) Church School, Sunday Section.

Kindergarten, 3—5 years. 5—7 years old mixed. 7—9 girls and boys separate. 9—11 ibid. 11 plus mixed.

(b) Church School. Evening Classes. Those who attend secondary school should not be compelled to attend the Sunday section of the school but rather to attend evening classes during the week.

(c) Church School. Confirmation Classes. The age of confirmation should be late rather than early. This should not be a formal matter but a personal decision. It is a matter more for the Vicar and the parents after that than anyone else. Consideration should be given to the possibility of a definite personal profession of faith in public after the style of some of the Scandinavian churches.

(d) Church School. Finishing Courses. Children who have left school or are just about to should be encouraged to attend discussion groups, boys and girls separate, in small numbers, with capable parishoners who might help them to see the importance of high standards and criterions in behaviour, appreciation, and judgement.

(e) Church School. Adult Section. Plans for such a section should be worked out in due course. It should be seriously considered whether or not a person should not be employed full time in the running of the church school. This might be a cleric, but not necessarily so.

Regarding the Teachers.

Teachers will generally be people without any special training. Preferably they will be married or mature people in contrast to teenagers. This will mean they cannot easily attend week-end courses. They should have, therefore, advisers.

Each group of teachers should have:—

(a) Someone to teach them what to teach.

(b) Someone to teach them how to teach.

The clergy will help in the first case and local day school teachers in the second case. They should arrange courses throughout the year for several weeks together, but not every week.

It is supremely important that the teachers only *use* the instruction and the books provided and do not simply repeat what they hear or read.

Nothing stands out from the last year's discussion so much as the fact that the faith must be taught the children by the person from his or her own context rather than that the teachers should imagine they must become "church workers" first.

Teachers might well work in pairs, This would encourage discussion, help discipline and create confidence. It would be a help in play acting, reading and the proper use of visual aids and drama games. It might even prompt critical observation of effects. The day school teacher should not be taken as a pattern.

Classes should not be more than ten for each group. A close relationship between teacher and family should be encouraged rather than between teacher and the individual pupil. This should be developed as much as possible out of school time.

Teachers should have one free Sunday a month if required.

Regarding the Syllabus.

Taking seriously the fact that teachers have the children for only about an hour a week at the most, too much emphasis seems to be laid on the syllabus and all embracing schemes of teaching. This kind of approach tends to sap vitality and spontaneity in teaching. Some doubt was expressed as to the actual value of long courses anyway.

The teacher should decide in his or her own terms a course of perhaps three or four months. Not too much importance should be paid to continuity.

The teaching period itself should be predominantly inspiring and directed to the will and heart of the child rather than the intellect. It should exemplify the heroic and the dramatic. Information and knowledge are very important, but these should be imparted and acquired another time and in another way. Teaching especially in the Sunday Section should not be modelled on religious instruction in schools.

The instructions should have the actual life and experience of the child as a basis, seeking to aid a deeper understanding of this, closely connecting it with growing up and indicating that the fullness of life lies in the future years.

Special care should be taken in the teaching of religious practice, and guidance about prayer and rules of life and behaviour should be practical and valuable in the light of the teachers' own experience. Children should not be encouraged to do what grownup's ignore. This we regard as in special need of careful consideration.

Teachers should have their classes for at least two years. They should be supplied with an abundance of current books from which to select their courses according to their own response; this would help spontaneity and freshness.

As well as having the lessons children should be required to pass certain "tests" (this is not a good word) of general knowledge and information in matters of the church and the faith. A system akin to the Scout badge system should be worked out for the children to pass. In this way they would on their own initiative and in their own time gather a basis of information and knowledge quite necessary to support the teaching at other times. Here the importance of learning by heart should not be ignored.

In conclusion, we would suggest that the aims of the Church School are:—

1. To develop the connection of the child with the church as he grows up,
   (a) By helping him to respect what the church stands for.
   (b) By associating the church in his experience with present happiness and preparation for a "grown up" life.
2. To provide religious instruction and a sensible introduction to adult life and adult religious practice.
3. To link the child with adult members of the congregation.

4. To educate the growing child to realise that the visible world and life in it is incomplete without a knowledge of the invisible world; that fullness of life involves God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; also a knowledge of right and wrong, a realisation of good and evil and attitudes of thankfulness, forgiveness and sacrifice; finally that nothing short of discipleship will do.

We realise that these are high sounding phrases, and perhaps little more than aspirations. They are nevertheless the first principles upon which we would like to see our children brought up. The next part of our report sets out the actual organisation we think will help to achieve this.

PART 2. SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE ACTUAL ORGANISATION.

The basic responsibility for the educational work of the parish lies with the Vicar and the Parochial Church Council. This should be recognised within the Council and without. There should be no questions of financial or other independence for the various organisations.

The Parochial Church Council should request a report from the various organisations as one body each year.

It is very important to avoid any developments, or any loyalties, or any ideas bout one particular organisation as a thing in itself. The first consideration is God and His Church and any part anyone plays in the organisation of the Church in the parish must be to the greater good of the whole. God and His Church must not be viewed in terms of the part.

The Advisory Council.

The Vicar through the P.C.C. should select and appoint an Advisory Council to comment and criticise the work of the Church with children and young people. This Council should represent:—

The P.C.C.

The Committed Members of the Parish.

The Non-Committed members of the Parish.

The Parent-Teacher Association.

The Schools in the Parish. (Day Schools).

The Law (e.g. Probation Office).

The Parent-Teachers Association.

The Parent-Teachers Association is regarded by all who had anything to do with this report as the foundation of any lasting influence on the children by the Church. All parents of children in the Church School will be encouraged to belong, and all who teach. Meetings will be held from time to time, making opportunities for teachers to know the problems of parents, and parents to know the intentions of the teachers; also social and other meetings will be encouraged. This Association will be based on the understanding that the Church is seeking to help the parents bring up their children in the knowledge and love of life in God's terms.

The Officers of the Association will be elected and the activities worked out in practice.

Guiding Principles.

The right person for any position must be appointed rather than the obvious person, or the person who thinks they ought to have it. This does not always mean those who have been most loyal to the church hitherto.

A very great obstacle will be the established loyalties and accepted groupings of people in the parish. "Cliques" as such cannot be avoided and should not always be discouraged, but they must be deliberately warned about the exclusive tendencies.

Where possible men should always be appointed rather than women when it involves contact with those outside the church and public witness.

There should be no economising in demands made for time, service and money; at the same time the P.C.C. should demand that these be well and truly used.

PART 2.—THE ORGANISATIONS.

The Mothers of Young Children.

This organisation is for the mothers and godmothers of children baptised in the church. They meet every month socially; and from time to time particularly in Advent and Lent are addressed on matters regarding their own faith and practice and also regarding the upbringing of their children.

The offices in charge are responsible for keeping in touch with the mothers and godmothers of all infants baptised, informing them of meetings and encouraging them to take seriously the vows made at baptism.

They arrange that the birthdays of all children of the church up to three years be remembered and refer each child who reaches this age to the clergy.

The Kindergarten

The church will provide a kindergarten held on Sundays for any children between the age of three and five. Teachers working in pairs will have groups of no more than ten each. Games and stories and a plentiful supply of equipment will be the basis of such teaching as is given.

The Church School.

This is divided into four groups for all children of the parish over five years old and under twelve: 5—7 mixed, 7—9 boys and girls separate, 9—11 boys and girls separate, 11 and over mixed.

Each group will have a number of teachers, one of whom will be in charge. Each group of teachers will have a qualified teacher to advise them on method and an adviser on the content of their teaching.

Children join the school at the request of their parents, and are admitted for a period of three months proving. They are then admitted as members after accepting the rules of the school. They remain in the same group for about two years. During this time they are not only expected to attend regularly, but also on their own initiative will be expected to attain several proficiency "badges" or to have passed certain "tests" based on religious knowledge and information as well as practice.

Membership Rules.

Subject to alteration the following practice is expected.

To pray for a few minutes each day.
To visit the church for private prayer once a week.
To keep a note book of private prayers.
To attend church school every week.
To give for God's work 1d. out of every 1/- pocket money.
To do one good deed every day.

Public Worship.

Every month one Sunday afternoon will be a Family Service for the parents and children of the church school. This service will be an attempt to familiarise all with the normal public worship of the church. Children will sit with their parents and not in classes.

At this service baptisms, if arranged will take place. The choir will be robed and every attempt made to realise the idea of the Catechumenate. This rather than Family Communion should be the service for young children.

Evening Classes.

Members of the Church school who reach the age of 11 plus and leave primary school for secondary school should not be compelled to remain in the Church School Sunday Section. They should be expected to join evening classes arranged during the week. These should be run by trained laymen or the clergy. They should continue for about three years and in the main be leading up to confirmation. Membership of the classes, however, should not be a guarantee of confirmation, although children of this age group will not be presented confirmation, although children of this age group will not be presented for confirmation if they have not attended the classes.

These classes will be increasingly imparting religious knowledge and instruction about the prayer book and Bible. Great care should be taken, however, to guide the will and fire the imagination rather then to impart religious ideas and information. Such a scheme has been run in the parish over the last year and a half with good results. At present some thirty odd children come each Thursday at 5.45 p.m. until 6.30. The time is spent in teaching and discussing throughout. There is no suggestion of club or social. There has been no falling away or serious absences over the past three months.

Confirmation Classes.

There should be no hard and fast decision about confirmation. Preferably the older the better. Only in circumstances where the whole family are committed Church people in fact as well as desire, will confirmation be encouraged before school-leaving age. This will be a matter for the parents to discuss with the Vicar, rather than one that the Vicar will raise with the parents. It will also be considered seriously whether some definite statement of faith and intent to be a faithful churchman be required of the confirmand in public at some time or other.

Post-Confirmation Classes.

One of the mistaken ideas about confirmation is that, having been confirmed there is nothing more to learn or to practice. It is closely associated with finishing school in this respect and somehow or other this idea must be changed. One experiment that is being carried

out is for mature adults under 35 years of age to prepare courses of about eight or ten sessions on "Growing up intelligently", and encourage a group of about six to eight young people, boys and girls separate, to their homes to discuss this. The subject matter should be at the discretion of the person and develop under the actual meetings. The main object is to add to the number of adults in the young peoples' lives whom they know and respect; to get the young people articulating the experience they have at home and work and among themselves, and to inject high standards of appreciation, behaviour and judgement. Not much more than hopes can be reported here as to the success of the experiment.

Adult Education.

Courses of Adult Education in Christian Faith and Practice are necessary in the normal framework of the parish.

Adult Confirmation Classes.

These are not to be confused with the above and courses will be held annually which are different to the Education Courses.

The Laymens' Ministry.

Guidance for the committed members of the church as to their witness to the faith at home and at work must be an essential part of the work of the parish. Although not much preparation with regard to this has been done yet.

"The other day I was buttonholed by a proselytiser for yet another society. What was wrong with the Church of England, I was assured, was that we just did not obey the Prayer Book; no wonder the laity were disgusted with their clergy. Take the bit, for instance, where we sang 'Come let us worship and fall down'. How many people did just that? Why, no one. If the whole congregation, vicar, choir, people and all fell flat on their faces at that point how much brighter Mattins would be!"

E. A. EVANS

The Approved School

Leslie Paul

I went to see an approved school the other day. The adjective that the school bears—"approved"—needs some explaining, for it's a school where young delinquents go, and it's hardly therefore approved by them. If the young step outside the law in Britain they become the concern of the Home Office, the ministry responsible for justice, police, prisons and so forth, and an approved school is in fact a school approved by the Home Office for the discipline and training of young offenders, though set up by some other authority. And a sentence passed upon the convicted young offender may very well be committal to an approved school for a period up to three years. The disapproved boy goes to the approved school, in fact, and there's still some confusion of thought as to whether he is sent there to be trained or punished or both. In my young days the bad boy got birched or sent to a "reformatory", which was a kind of juvenile prison complete with all its odours and disciplines, and often so harsh that it marked a boy for life. The remarkable thing about the modern approved school is that you would not easily guess that it was a place for young offenders. At this one there was not even a porter's lodge, or a high fence, or a closed gate. It looked as easy to sail out of as to sail into, and indeed while I was there a couple of sixteen-year-olds, not long back from Christmas leave, and feeling the reaction, elected to march off down the highway in workshop dungarees, visible a mile off in the snowy countryside, and were picked up by a passing police car and dumped on the door-step again within the hour. There's no atmosphere of constraint or fear in the houses or workshops. Indeed the school discipline seems to involve far less heart-fluttering than at the average public school, where boys much younger are beaten far more often, and are more continually run off their feet.

For some time now in Britain we've been agitated about juvenile delinquency: we are too soft with young criminals, people have been saying, and crimes of violence and sexual assault are on the increase. We can't easily forget the case of young Craig who shot and killed a policeman. Well, it's said, gentle methods have failed

to stop crimes by the young, who are becoming contemptuous of the law. There's a great deal of loose generalisation, but the alarm is understandable. It may very well be that we have failed to make some young criminals understand that society can get tough too, and a really punitive detention centre to handle the hard core of juvenile crime has been set up as a consequence. It remains to be seen whether it will prove effective.

But for a generation now in Britain the emphasis has been not on the punishment but on the reclamation of the young offender. It was thought to be, even at the lowest material level, far more costly to society to produce a professional criminal by the repressive disciplines of bad boys, than to spend all the resources the nation could spare on making him a good citizen again. And the approved school I visited is extremely conscious of its teaching and reforming role, and it is only one unit in a nation-wide network of schools, institutions, and committees devoted to straightening out young lives.

In the school, the boys, who were seniors (aged about 15 or 16 on committal) lived in houses. There were two large houses of forty-four each, and two small ones of about 15. The houses were separate buildings, not administrative fictions, and were grouped pleasantly along a crescent on either side of an immense water tower, which dominated the flat lands of Essex, and to which all the other school buildings appeared to be doing reverence. Perhaps this had some symbolic significance, and the god of cleanliness was being worshipped. I had a meal in one of the smaller houses where a housemaster and his wife were charged with the task of providing a homelike atmosphere for a dozen or so younger, or less mature boys who had been guilty of crimes or had suffered as the victims of them. What sticks in my mind about this clean and cheerful house is what the housemaster said afterwards. He said that though the records of all his boys were up at the office and he could consult them any time, he never looked at one of them unless its owner got into trouble and he had to. Not laziness or unwillingness was at the back of this, but a sensitive regard for the privacy of a boy's life. Before landing up in this house the boy might have been to several other institutions, such as remand homes, or classifying centres, or other approved schools. He is certain to have been examined and cross-examined by doctors, probation officers, magistrates, educational officials and his crimes and problems will

have become a burden to himself as well as to the community, and a public exhibit discussed *ad nauseam*. The exhibitionist boy gets no good out of this: the retiring sort grows sullen or weary. The attitude of the housemaster was clear: let me be without prejudice or preconceived opinions about the boy, if I can be, and let the boy have a chance to establish himself anew, as a person, as a friend, irrespective of his past. He didn't put it in theological language, but what he was saying was clear enough: the young offender not only need the cure of whatever was crooked in his soul, he wanted the forgiveness of his sins—that necessary chance to begin again without which many of us would be damned, I'm afraid.

And this was pretty well the attitude throughout the school. I can't say that it animates the whole approved school system, because I don't know, but it is a prevalent one. However, it is all very well to decide that the boy must have a chance to begin again, with his past atoned for—but will he take it? This school claimed about sixty per cent successes, which meant that only forty in every hundred were in trouble again within three years of leaving. That represents a reasonable percentage of reclamation when the background of the boys is considered. More than half, for instance, have a bad or erratic record of employment, and more than half come from homes incomplete in some way or another—lacking either father, or mother, or both. The material conditions do not seem so important: only 13 per cent have really poverty stricken background. It's a different kind of poverty which makes them criminals: a spiritual and cultural destitution: they are the wreckage of modern society, which makes terrific technical and nervous demands even of the very young. Half the boys who come to approved schools do not know what the world is all about. For instance, 56 per cent of the boys at this school were below the average ability of elementary schoolboys, and some 16 per cent had physical weaknesses or defects on admission. If you add all these things up—dullness, backwardness, semi-literacy, erratic home background, sense of inferiority, the strain of modern society—you get, often enough, the explanation of the lapse into larceny, or breaking and entering, which is what most of them are convicted of.

The approved school must take its assorted problem children, and in time preciously short (for a boy may be released on licence within eighteen months) and in face perhaps of the hostility of the boy, and the indifference of the parents, if any, has to try and build

up a stable world for the broken youth and introduce him to a steady trade. As an example of the way in which these boys are often not in our world, perhaps I can relate that a 17-year-old's exercise book lay open before him in class and I saw that the names of General Eisenhower and Governor Stevenson were written down in his laborious notes. I pointed to Eisenhower and after long cogitation the boy remembered that he was President of the United States, but Stevenson he could not recall. *Our* world may be one in which we read books, listen to music, discuss God, or communism, but most of these boys live in a world of private fantasy in which three things loom large—comics, cinema and cigarettes.

The work of reclamation nevertheless can be done. A contingent of Air Cadets from this school attended a camp in the Isle of Wight last year, and in competition with units from public and grammar schools won the cup for smartness and efficiency: quite a remarkable achievement. But the work of reclamation is costly. It usually costs more to keep one boy for a week at the school than his father back home will earn to keep all the rest of the family. We can understand therefore why people ask—is it all necessary, and is it doing its job anyway? And it has to be said, in defence, that the approved school gets the salvage jobs, which in any business are difficult and expensive. The young chap who has developed criminal tendencies may be cured of them here: but the approved school can do nothing to prevent him getting them. The real root of the problem in any society, not just in Britain, starts farther back, much farther back, it's to be found in the home, in the loving discipline the child gets or does not get, in the moral values of parents and friends. The youngster who gets into the approved school is often there because no one did a proper job with him round about the age of six or seven. And if we want to save the expensive shoring up of these damaged buildings the duty is to build more solidly in the beginning, and spiritually not simply materially.

SEEN ON A CHURCH NOTICE BOARD

"A religion that fears science insults God and commits suicide."

Your God is Too Big!

David Nicholls

The influence of the Public Schools in England is pervasive and often pernicious. The Church of England is by no means immune from this influence, and it would not, I think, be unfair to argue that public school religion is partially responsible for some of the unfortunate characteristics of the national church. The one thing which appears to be drummed into the child by teachers, chaplains and school friends is that, whatever happens, he must not be, nor give the impression of being, pious. From his first days at school, when he is confronted by the chaplain—muscular, pipe smoking and rugger playing—till the day he leaves he has impressed upon him the ignominy of being "pi". Gentlemen go to church, indeed, but any undue display of religious emotion or private piety is not nice. Religion, he is taught, affects the whole of life—it has to do with the boxing ring and the cricket pitch quite as much as it has to do with church and praying, perhaps rather more; we only go to church to become good chaps. He proceeds to university where he is encouraged in this notion. Unless he happens to join a branch of the I.V.F. his religion will be hidden for the most part. The boy might, as they say, get religion badly: he might go to chapel more than once a week or hang a crucifix in his room; but efforts will be made by his fellow Christians to restore the lad to a normal life. Christianity he will be told, is concerned with the whole of life; his religious feelings must at all costs be dispersed and diluted. "He is becoming frightfully pi", will be the comment of his public school friends. I once asked a man who was off to give a talk to some theological students, what he was going to tell them. "Oh", came the reply, "I'll just tell them not to be too pi". When Christians meet non-Christians, when parish priests call on their parishioners, when industrial chaplains talk to "the chaps", there is one subject, it is said, which must on all accounts be avoided—the dread subject of religion. It may, perhaps, be surreptitiously introduced at a very late stage in the discussion, and in this case it is advisable, apologetically, to usher it in with a little joke.

The time has surely come for the Church of England to recognise the plain fact that the majority of people are interested in religion;

that they need it and that many of them want it. The church is primarily a religious organisation, and the Christian gospel caters for the religious needs of men. It is the job of the church to preach, to pray, to sing hymns and to encourage and develop the pious feelings of its members; these feelings can only be developed for the vast majority of people in communion with others in a visible church. People want religion and the only orthodox Christian communion which will give it to them in contemporary Britain is the Roman Catholic Church. The Church of England has been giving people moral uplift, respectability, youth clubs and drama groups, it has even talked about sociological integration and put forward cautious and conservative schemes for the reorganisation of society and for bishops in presbytery—all of which are admirable objects of ecclesiastical patronage—but it has failed, speaking generally, to give people true religion. It has failed to cater to those religious feelings, needs and desires which are present in human nature. Religion is not concerned with the whole of life, but with a part of life. Our attitudes to many non-religious problems cannot entirely be divorced from our religion, nor should they be, but it is their *religion* which distinguishes Christians from heathen. Certainly some Christians will find it necessary to attempt a rationalisation of their religious sentiments into a theological system, and their conclusions in this realm will affect our life and ideas in other spheres; some political arrangements will be anathema to Christians. Yet in politics, as in sport there will be many occasions when Christians can meet with non-Christians accepting a common set of norms; when the influence of religion upon the Christian will be so remote as to be practically irrelevant.

What can be done to make the church more religious? It is impossible to change the whole outlook of an institution in a short period. There is much to suggest that an increasingly large percentage of clergy, from backgrounds where this gentlemanly denigration of religion is less apparent, will do something. Certainly something must be done. The prestige of the Church of England, particularly among "intellectuals" is at an all time low. Morale within the church, apart from a few freak parishes, is not high. A teacher at one of the theological colleges told me some months ago of the notable lack of enthusiasm among students; the prevailing sentiment is, he observed, a vague idea that things must go on. There is no sense of being on the verge of great things. There is considerable doubt

about what the church ought to be doing. If I am right, this general slump is not entirely unconnected with our neglect of relgion. What then is to be done?

First we must recognise that there are different levels of spirituality in the church: we must avoid depriving those who want more and asking too much from those who have only a little to give. The Church of England today alienates both groups: we cater only for the lukewarm. Much of what has been said is pertinent to the first group; these people must be encouraged and directed, we must lose our terror of holiness. For the other group something must be done. We should recognise that some people have less to give than others. In our insistence on one level of spirituality—we are all "saints" protestantism tells us—we make religion too difficult for some and unsatisfying for others. There can be little doubt that the Church of England makes Christianity too difficult for a large number of people in the country. There should, for example, be a minimum of religious duties which would be taught with the authority of the church. The recent attempt of the Archbishops to produce such a guide was a failure only surpassed by the abortive venture to set up an Enquiry Centre, and is indicative of the lack of religious leadership from which the church has suffered in recent years. These things are more important than canon law! Daily Bible study and daily prayers in the home are often quite unrealistic demands; calling into church would be much more practicable for the majority. But people do not like to be seen in church during the week—that is being "pi". It is not, I think, true that Matins is a service with a wider appeal than the Mass, but do we not ask too much of people when we put forward weekly communion as the norm for all? There is nothing wrong with encouraging non-communicating attendance for those who would find it too great a responsibility to communicate every week. God does not demand of men more than they can give; the church certainly should not.

We must, then increase our emphasis upon the church as a *religious* organisation with a *limited* purpose. Will this solve the problem touched upon earlier of the low repute of the church among the intellectuals? By intellectuals I mean not academics (among whom the Church of England has always enjoyed a considerable reputation) but those people who read the *New Statesman* on Friday and the *Observer* on Sunday, who listen to the Third Programme and read *Pelican* books. In a previous generation things were different;

the names of T. S. Eliot, Charles Williams and Dorothy Sayers come to mind. Intellectuals today, however, find little attraction in the Church of England and so far as they are drawn to religion at all it is to Rome (or Zen Buddism!) What can be done here? An increasing piety is one thing. Also the church needs people who are willing to write and speak to such a popular audience, even if it means some sacrifice of their academic status or prospects. Not all have the gifts but some have. We lack apologists to engage in *ad hominem* arguments with contemporary agnostics; there are plenty of us interested in the truth for its own sake, where are we to look for those interested in the truth for its own sake, where are we to look for those interested in the truth for God's sake? The religious communities are the obvious place, but with some individual exceptions, we look in vain.

After a short visit to the United States some years ago, an eminent churchman lamented "the appalling religiosity of America". I am sure that he was wrong. The churches are much less "religious" than in England; they are social and devastatingly efficient business concerns. The average priest or minister is to be found not in his church, nor in his study, nor visiting his parishionners, but in his church office. The churches are amazingly "successful". The Church of England, as ever, falls between two stools: it is neither religious nor efficient, and it loses respect all round. We must take the path of piety.

It is conventional at Christmas to think of Jesus as poor and cold, one of the dispossessed. This is sentimental. He had all the riches that any human baby needs. Mary was there to keep him warm, fed and adored, Joseph to protect. He had a settled home. His foster father was not a labourer hired by the day but an artisan, who even had some property in Bethlehem. Everyone in the village knew, or thought they knew, who he was. In other words he was born into security though of a modest kind. There were plenty of dispossessed in the land of Christ's birth. There were many orphans and slaves but the Son of God was not born among them. Must we not conclude that the need of the developing human personality for security of this kind is absolute?

(From **Half Angels** by Elisabeth Montefiore, *Faith Press*, 8*s*. 6*d*.)

Eichmann, Isaiah, and the C.N.D.

H. Palmer

The Israelis had various reasons for staging the trial of Adolf Eichmann. They wanted, no doubt, to avenge their dead. They wanted, certainly, to execute justice on an official murderer. They wanted to remind the world of what the Nazis had done; to warn the Germans of what Nazism might do again. But most of all—as was shown by the elaborate arrangements for internal publicity—they wanted to address their own people. Let the Jews of today realise in full the horrors which Gentiles had inflicted, only yesterday, on an unorganised and defenceless Jewry. It need never happen again. Israel could be, quite literally, their salvation.

The "testimony unto Israel" came out clearly in the fourth week of the trial. A London businessman told how he was given a bucket of acid and told to scrub the pavement. With him were aged Rabbis in their priestly robes. "If the Lord wills", said the Rabbis, "we will do it." Men orphaned as children told how neatly their families were prepared for mass execution; undressed, marched to the common grave, and shot into it. "Why didn't you resist?" asked the prosecutor; to everyone's surprise at first, but he kept on asking every witness the same question. "You outnumbered them ten to one, why didn't you make a rush?" "Because we had no weapons, because of the reprisals, because we had lost hope", came the sad replies.

Then came the escapes. Men and women felt they "had to live"; jumped from the death train, joined the partisans and fought from the forests. Some survived to tell the tale. Others organised an underground resistance, sharing their last potato, training for the inevitable and unsuccessful battle with well-armed storm-troops, fully fed and fighting fit. Desperate encounters and terrifying heroism were recalled from the last days of the Warsaw ghetto.

This arrangement of the witnesses was not accidental. The prosecutor was saying to his countrymen "all this happened to us, but we took it different ways. Some lay down and prayed, others stood up and fought. All this could happen again. Will you cower behind

your religion and hope for the storm to pass? Or will you fight to the end for the right to live and be a Jew?"

The choice is not a new one. It has been presented to every generation in Judaism, and in every generation some have chosen one way, and some another. Quietists and zealots were both of one nation. Both appealed to the same historic faith.

Isaiah cried, "Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help; and stay on horses and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen, because they are very strong; but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord!" (31.1, A.V.). King Hezekiah was planning a revolt against Assyria, with the promise of Egyptian help if it came to a fight. Isaiah was against foreign alliances. He was even, it would seem, against fighting.

Wise after the event, the commentators commend Isaiah for his world-historical statesmanship. He realised, they assure us, that Assyria was an incomparably powerful empire; that Egypt would never fulfil her promises; that Judah, in the realities of the eighth century, would shake off one only to become vassal to the other. "In such a situation", they make him suggest, "what is the good of revolt?"

The commentators want us to take Isaiah for a defeatist. He had private and reliable information that they would lose, so he advised against fighting. But Isaiah was not a defeatist; not even a divinely inspired, informed, and authorised defeatist. He never said "it is not worth fighting" but "Let God fight for you". In modern terms, Isaiah was a pacifist.

What, after all, were the political alternatives before his country? They could remain faithful to Assyria. They could change their allegiance, and acknowledge Egypt. They could attempt a precarious independence by playing off one against the other.

Which side was Isaiah on? Not the Egyptians', certainly. Nor yet the Assyrians', for he looks forward to their discomfiture. Neither would he allow neutralism. Whichever line his government takes Isaiah, like a true Opposition, is against it.

The fact is, that Isaiah had no *political* alternative to propose. His religion was to replace any and every sort of politics. "Trust God, and let him look after you."

We can trace the two traditions throughout the history of Judaism. The fighters return and rebuild Jerusalem. The pacifists stay on to worship God in the Diaspora. The Maccabees, then the zealots and

messaianists of two Jewish wars, fight and lose the battle for a Jewish nation. The Stern gang and the Zionists win it at last and return once more to the holy land. Today the prophets are still taught in the Talmudic colleges of a resurgent Jerusalem, and their quietist followers are still worshipping God among the Gentiles. The new State will show them Eichmann, and reunite Jewry at last into a fully combatant nation of Israel.

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament presents us with a similar choice. Should we pursue our ends politically, with whatever weapons our enemies may prepare. Or should we resign ourselves *and our nation* to God, and wait to see what he will do with it?

It would suit the politicians to argue this out within politics. And if Isaiah had had to argue on the level of the commentators, he would have made no disciples at all. Hindsight does not count for present questions—what is *likely* to happen, what is it *expedient* for us to do? To commit everything to God is to refuse even to look at the probabilities. That is quite inexpedient.

Nuclear Disarmament is sometimes commended as "the only sane policy". I distrust this political approach. It is, of course, inexpedient to get oneself killed. But it appears quite expedient to avoid getting killed by threatening instant death to your opponent. Neither of these truisms came in with Hiroshima. The nuclear "deterrent" has been in operation for a dozen years now, without a catastrophe. Whatever resulted from unilateral disarmament would almost certainly be worse for us than what we have now.

A pacifist may not look at what may happen to him (and his). He regards what will certainly happen to other people. If we drop the bomb on Moscow (as Lord Russell was advocating not so long ago) we may or may not save our skins and our institutions. We shall certainly destroy in a devilish manner a very large number of Muscovites. That is the only good reason, and in my view it is a sufficient reason, for throwing the damnable thing away.

Pacifism is not a policy. It is instead of political policies. It is of course open to debate whether pacifists come off better in any century; whether Isaiah's king or one of Eichmann's victims would have done better not to fight. The politicians win this debate—on the question of probabilities, of what seems the best thing to do—the moment the pacifist enters it. The pacifist is not interested in the debate, for he is not still looking for an answer. He is already trying to live one.

The Everlasting Reward

F. H. Brabant

Part of the reaction against 'other-worldliness' which has been so prevalent is a tendency to discount any desire for rewards after death as a motive for conduct. It implies that all direct desire for happiness, here or hereafter, is selfish and therefore sub-Christian. This work reconsiders such a position. The discussion derives substance and authority from an examination of the works of Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, St. Augustine, Luther, Berkeley and Bagehot (among others), of the dispute between Fénélon and Bossuet, and of the Bible itself. 15*s net*

Ancient Christian Writers:
Volume 29

St. Augustine: On the Psalms

VOLUME I PSALMS 1-29

Translated and annotated by Dame Scholastica Hebgin and Dame Felicitas Corrigan

'This first volume of St. Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, clearly and readably translated and modestly annotated by two nuns of Stanbrook, is an excellent introduction to St. Augustine the working bishop, preaching to his flock, and also to the way in which, like other Fathers of the Church, he read and understood the Scriptures. It is a way highly disconcerting at first to modern minds, whether of scholars trained in historical and critical exegesis, or of ordinary people who think that words in any book, the Bible included, mean just what ordinary modern people who have been taught to read think they mean . . . This ancient "spiritual" interpretation is not a substitute for modern scholarly exegesis, or an excuse for ignoring the problems which it raises, but it is an indispensable complement to it . . .' *The Tablet*
'Persevering ones will be rewarded by those passages—and there will surely be some—that yield them new insights into the Christian faith.' *W. Telfer, Theology.* 35*s net*

Longmans

Moral Re-Armament

A Letter to an Enquirer from John Wilkinson

"Frank Buchman", writes one of his supporters, "Initiator of Moral Re-Armament, has spent a lifetime creating and multiplying a new type of man to build a new type of society. He believes that the art of remaking men is basic equipment for the statesman and the ordinary man" (*Report on Moral Re-Armament*, London, 1955, p. 52, n.1). And as we read the words our hackles go up—higher and higher.

Yet why should the members of the Church be so hesitant? M.R.A. stands for the things they value, for one would hope the Church would set a premium on the "four absolutes", honesty, purity, unselfishness, love. The Church, like M.R.A., is committed to a life under the "guidance" of God. The Church, M.R.A.'s senior by some centuries, has always been charged with the message that men are prone to sin, and stand in urgent need of repentance and change.

Nor will any but the most bigoted churchman deny that the M.R.A. man who has been "changed" is not only sincere in his adherence to these excellent principles, but willing to pursue them with a devotion and a self-sacrifice which is only too often lacking in the members of the Churches. Thus no small part of the criticisms of M.R.A. which come from the side of the official churches may be tinged slightly, or more than slightly, with envy at the striking results of the movement.

It is well known that when Buchman, an ordained Lutheran, began his missionary work, the Oxford Group which resulted were explicitly concerned with "the advancement of the Christian religion". Yet since 1938, the name Moral Re-Armament has been more and more in use, and the accent of the movement seems to have been increasingly on politics. This could be interpreted as a decline. If M.R.A. is a form of religion, then it has fallen into the error of Jeroboam the son of Nebat: religion is the sprat to catch the mackerel of communism. But this interpretation does not fit the teaching of Buchman. "M.R.A.", he says, "is not another church. It is a gateway to the church".

Thus it is no argument against M.R.A. to plead that its doctrines

are not a full expression of the Christian faith. They never set out to be: and this is why not only Free Churchmen, Anglicans and Roman Catholics can support it without censure, but Buddhists and Shintoists as well. M.R.A. is a method of approach to the problems of life in a rush-ridden, sin-ridden, neurosis-ridden century, and the number, enthusiasm, and—some would be tempted to add—the social position of its adherents bear witness to its capacity to satisfy many urgent needs. The method assumes that men are unsatisfactory both to themselves and to society so long as they are suffering from the disease of sin. But by the recognition of the four absolutes as accessible principles of conduct, and the penitent "sharing" of sin in confession, a man returns, by the action of God in him, to a healthy and normal life, and sets out in the fellowship of M.R.A. determined to seek the guidance of God for action in each day.

So far as this method goes, it has common links with the methods of traditional Christianity all along the line. It does not mention all the positive values of Christianity; not salvation, nor the power of the risen Christ. But it does provide a substratum for religious awareness and response, which is applicable to many forms of belief in God.

Half a loaf is better than no bread. But there is always the danger that M.R.A. by its utopian claims, and the vividness of the conversion-experiences to which it leads, will suggest that half a loaf is better than a whole one. M.R.A. may become, if not in its official statements, at least in the minds of its adherents, a substitute for religion. This danger may at times become serious in a traditionally Christian community, but in others, where Christians are in a minority, M.R.A. is often welcomed by Christians of all kinds as an introduction to religion, and a force in the battle against materialism.

As a self-contained religious system, M.R.A. would be seriously lacking. Though the system contains many of the elements of the fuller theological systems by Churches, these are often not only incompletely expressed, but in the wrong order. There is a tendency visible at the outset of the conversion-process to see the acknowledgement of sin as the means to a knowledge of God, rather than as the outcome of God's initiative, and to put works before grace. This tendency makes itself apparent not only in the actual process of conversion, with its great emphasis on sin as the starting-point

(rather than God), but also in the great bias of the movement's publicity to stress the social, political or industrial results which will be achieved by M.R.A.—and this at the expense of an essential element taught in the churches, the duty of worship.

Yet as a force for good, M.R.A. remains powerful. There is no gainsaying the achievements of the movement in the promotion of industrial peace, and no doubt at all that it has sent many Christians back to their churches with a new sense of the need for a regular and committed life in the worshipping community. Again, however, M.R.A. is not a political philosophy any more than it is a religion. Its members are often naive in the expression of political views, and tend too easily to equate political units with the sum of the individuals who make them up.

This naiveté is very often the point at which critics feel they can deliver the most lethal blows. And let it be admitted that the theological imprecision of M.R.A. publications does the movement a grave disservice. As one example we may cite their use of the Bible. It has been the belief of the Church that the Bible is the basis of Christian teaching, but that it is to be used for this purpose in the context of church-membership. Thus the churchman who perhaps spends some time at home quietly reading his Bible does so as part of a pattern of Christians living which includes the exposition of the Bible in sermons. His reading is thus influenced and informed by systematic teaching. M.R.A., on the other hand, makes no pretence to be a Church, and thus, for a Christian, is hampered in its approach to the Bible. This is not to say nor to imply that no good can come of reading the Bible outside the Church; it is merely to suggest that to substitute this approach to the Bible for that of the authentic Christian churches would be dangerous.

Yet it must be added that the very naiveté of the movement makes its own special appeal. Not only does it make for a simple, and patently effective publicity, but it provides also a hypnotically appealing alternative to the complexities of over-theological churches or over-intellectualised politics. The strength of this appeal witnesses to a weakness in preachers and politicians, but it is a symptom besides of a retreat from reason which cannot, in the long run, produce satisfying results.

"M.R.A. has been compared", says the *Report* (p. 67), "to a bulldozer which overthrows the protective barriers of all sorts which one builds through pride, egoism, fear, and so on": the use of

this kind of language, like that of "creating and multiplying a new type of man" is perhaps the most daunting of all aspects of M.R.A. It suggests the kind of scene in which one of Sartre's most crooked commissars seriously asks a victim whether he is not lying, and whether his parents had not taught him that lying was wrong. It is no part of the Christian teaching that we should bulldoze men out of their sin. Christ and his followers will force no man, but win him with a "great love". On the one hand this very great love has been singled out by some observers as M.R.A.'s most notable feature. But reports vary. And we hear on the other hand reports which compare the processes of M.R.A. to mass-suggestion or to brain-washing. Does M.R.A. set out to mould men inexorably to a type? Are the propaganda-plays, repeated night after night to the same audience, a form of compulsive pressure? Why should Caux induce claustrophobia in some of its guests? And if these questions are unworthy, why should it be that men who have been "changed" by M.R.A. should, like their undesirable contemporaries the Jehovah's Witnesses, be so impervious to all reasoned criticism which refuses to agree with them?

From the early days of Oxford Groups right through to the present time, M.R.A. has had its casualties. Though in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred M.R.A. has by its contacts probably achieved actual good in the lives it has touched, there are just enough reports of nervous breakdowns, and of divided homes to make the results of M.R.A. a subject about which it would be rash to generalise.

Thus while the Churches cannot fail to approve most of the general expressions of M.R.A. teaching, and to admire both the quality and the quantity of the positive results which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, they have received, they cannot allow themselves to be indiscrimate in their approbation, and they will be very careful indeed to keep away from the movement those of their members who show signs of emotional or psychological instability.

A Short Bibliography (Chronologically arranged)

Henson, H. H. *The Group Movement*, O.U.P., London, 1933.

Crossman, R. H. S., Ed., *Oxford and the Groups*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1934.

Howard, Peter, *That Man Frank Buchman*, Blandford Press, London, 1946.

Williamson, G., *Inside Buchmanism*, Watts & Co., London, 1954.

Church Assembly, Social and Industrial Council, *Moral Re-Armament, A Study of the Movement*, (C.A.1129), London, 1955.

Mowat, R. C., *Report on Moral Re-Armament*, Blandford Press, London, 1955.

Lunn, Sir A., *Enigma, A Study of Moral Re-Armament*, Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1957.

Lund Yates, B., *Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman's Contribution to Contemporary Religious Thought*, Article reprinted from *The Hibbert Journal*, October, 1958.

Yates, Ivan, *M.R.A., An Ideology of Change*, and *M.R.A., A Strong Streak of Naivety*, articles in *The Observer*, 19th March and 26th March, 1961.

Comment

T.W.B. and R.D. write:

IN OUR COMMENT last month about the former Provost of Guildford we attempted to describe what the situation looked like from the outside. Dr. Reindorp, the Bishop of Guildford, for whom we have the highest respect and admiration, has now informed us that in linking his name with the decision with regard to Mr. Boulton we were wholly in error. We now know that he had no part in the decision and was not consulted. We also unreservedly withdraw the allegation that Dr. Reindorp was involved in a conspiracy to bundle the Provost out of his job with subterfuge and trickery, and apologise sincerely to Dr. Reindorp. The intention of our comment was to summarise the press's reaction to the affair and also the appearance this presented to the public and we regret that this, in addition to giving offence to Dr. Reindorp, transgressed the standards of Christian courtesy.

R.D. writes:

Maurice Reckitt asks (*Prism,* June 1961): Have we to suspect that the Church is simply giving up thinking about what is involved for the spirit of man in such a civilisation because it is too difficult to bring an understanding of it to the point of positive application? That seems to me the question that should be asked and must be answered. Perhaps it can be answered in quasi-historical personal terms.

Christian sociology was the study of a group of fine and dedicated Christians who had the leisure, the delight in each other's company, the enjoyment of good thought and good talk which was the characteristic of educated amateurism between the wars. Conferences and magazines and manifestos, reading parties and memos—I'm not running down any of them, but an attempt to understand the background of the work of the Christendom group brings at least some of these things to light. But it's different now. Different in very stupid but action-affecting ways: we don't have nannies for our children, or maids to do the washing up; working at a middle-class job is much more exacting than it was; and then we've seen a lot of conferences go by—Summit ones, disarmament ones, U.N., even

Lambeth ones and the result is we're a bit off conferences. We understand the force of the question Mr. Reckitt asks, and has spent many years of his life trying with patience and determination to answer; and our answer—the answer of those on PRISM who don't understand about sociology—is this: the state of affairs in this country since the welfare state is from a spiritual point of view pretty desperate; the state of the world is more desperate still; and we are preoccupied and busy bringing up families (I suspect fathers spend a lot more time with their children than they used to). We are trying to be Christians, we ask the same questions as you did. But whereas you had the optimism and resilence to sit down and try to think out answers, we say we don't know the answer, perhaps there isn't one, all we can do is to try and live a Christian life, at home and at work and let God give, if he will, the increase. I don't want to say that this is right and the earlier attempts were wrong, for I don't believe it, although I do believe there are advantages even in the present limitations and cautious agnosticism. Life and Liberty, Maurice and Temple—these existed in a different time and it's no good asking where are the Temples of today and tomorrow? There is something much more like a return to the cultivating of our gardens; a phrase suggesting—what I think is true—a tactical withdrawal from the confrontation of the world with Christianity at a time when the world does not need or appear to need Christianity. I am fully aware that these inadequate sentences all require explanation, amplification and qualification. But that must wait for another time.

Guthrie Moir writes:

An attack seems to be developing against the modest increases in the Church's central administration which were sparked off or foreshadowed by the Ridley Report. In those days the inadequacy of the Church central machinery was constantly under fire. Now the much needed improvements are being made, and the Church can boast a professional staff in the twin fields of Information and of Radio and Television. To meet the new situation a new generation of critics, led by Mr. Eberhard Wedell, has sprung up to play variations on the dated theme of "back to the parish".

Emphasis on the local church ignores the phenomenon that mid-twentieth-century Britain is a peripatetic Britain as never before. Within our small islands our ant-like population is churning about

ceaselessly. At least a third of greater London's population lives in two places at once. It surges away from the metropolitan area every week-end and every holiday. One person may attend one or more churches in London during the week, but belong to the parochial roll of a distant diocese, although he will only be there for occasional week-ends. There is less sense of belonging to one local community than ever before. This is partly due, in the Home Counties at any rate, to the fact that so many rural localities are totally changing their character, almost always for the worse and against the wishes of the local inhabitants, as a result of the inexorable and misguided outspill of London. These factors alone have done much to undermine the traditional parochial structure.

Good public relations and the machinery to obtain them are surely universally regarded today as an integral part of business and administrative efficiency. That administration cannot be regarded as thoroughly efficient which does not seem and is not consistently seen by the outside world to be so.

It is always easy to criticise any civil service in the British tradition. The civil servants seldom have the right or the means to counter-attack. It is however surely absurd to sneer or attempt to equate with current ecclesiastical lifemanship the serious effort expended in the last year and a half to build up for the first time an efficient and professional department at Church House on the public relations and information side. Where before there was often silence from the Church and consequently uninformed conjecture in the newspapers, now there is a constant outflow of information and ideas. A brisk air of professional competence has suddenly begun to invest every activity, and they are now legion, of the Church Information Office.

Anybody who works in the media of mass communication now knows that he has a number of professional colleagues at Church House on whose help, judgment and discretion he can rely. The television producer knows he can generally get quick and expert assistance over the best available Anglican participants in a given programme, or even, if he wishes, advice from the Church's point of view on the structure of the programme or series itself. He may even find himself to his surprise being sold on an altogether new idea or even a complete programme. The officers concerned, both lay and clerical, get around as never before. They know their way and are known in Fleet Street and they have taken the trouble to

get to know the key people in broadcasting and television, B.B.C. and Commercial alike. Their enthusiasm for the new media is even beginning to communicate itself to the Church at large.

Anglican publications have been in a muddle for years. In this field each central committee and board likes to be a law unto itself. There has resulted a great outflow of publications, with too little attention to the potential readership. Is it not incidentally a reflection of the traditional internal anarchy that the Church's Schools Council can still present to the Pilkington Committee a report in some respects diametrically opposed to that of the Church's Radio and Television Council, while Bishops present a third point of view, in the House of Lords? All may claim to speak as the authentic voice of the Church in this tangled field. Surely nothing could be more sensible and conducive to coherence and administrative efficiency at this time than to pull together the pronunciamenta of all the authentic voices under the eye of one confident professional publications officer.

The Enquiry Centre is one branch of public relations in which the Roman Catholic Church has been leading for several decades unchallenged by Ecclesia Anglicana except for one brief and abortive sortie. The object should be not to compete with the Roman Catholics but to provide an alternative service of information about the Faith which may appeal to and satisfy those who, having been brought up in the English tradition, seek a wholly English answer to their quest for truth.

No doubt the Church should be especially careful in the use of public relations techniques. No doubt it behoves the Church to insist on an absolute standard of honesty and accuracy in its reports, statistics and press hand-outs. But when all the caveats have been entered the fact remains that the Church, in the mid-twentieth century, in a virtually over-developed country, where the mass media have a wide range of influence over ideas, opinion and even behaviour, simply cannot afford to be anything but efficient in its public relations. The concept of the remnant and of the cell and of the narrowly introverted parochial set up, with its rigid separation of the sheep and the goats, these still have their place. But the bigger, nobler age-old vision, of Ecclesia Anglicana as the true spiritual landscape in which our native and national piety can best develop and expand, demands an altogether more open and outward looking approach and at all levels of the Church to all our fellow

citizens, Christians, agnostics and atheists alike. The realisation of this vision can only be impeded by prismatic attacks and the sniping of "Parson and Parish" at the Church's new-found efficiency in the sphere of public relations.

The Editor writes:

It is not difficult to imagine what has stimulated the Bishop of Leicester into his pronouncements of the Guildford affair.

It seems highly probable that he knows some facts about that case which are not known to most of us and therefore, stung by the injustice of the attacks on the authorities, he has leapt to their defence.

It should first of all be said that the anger of critics is not so much at the injustice of the Guildford affair as such—it may well be that there are other facets to this which have not come to light —but at the complacency and incompetence of the leaders of the Church in allowing the Church to continue under a Constitution where it can appear to be involved in a nasty hole-and-corner conspiracy with the Crown, and no amount of compensating factors in the case can alter the fact that *this is what it has looked like.*

But secondly it is peculiar that, however good his motives, the Bishop of Leicester should indulge in double talk in his attack on the critics. Dr. Williams is a scholar and must know that when he says "If the Church is to be stripped of all mystery, there is a danger that what is left will be much less interesting and serviceable to the Kingdom of God than what we have at the present time" he is tricking his audience by confusing two meanings of the word "mystery". It was Chesterton, I think, who said that a mystery in the theological sense "was not an interesting uncertainty but an inexpressible certainty". The mystery of the Church is something that can not be taken away from it, but the muddles and secrecies of the Church can and must go. They are not worthy of He who is the Way, the Truth and the Light.

His use of the phrases "The umpire's decision is final" and "The Crown can do no wrong" are equally baffling. The Crown is apparently identified with the umpire, but the idea that one does not question the umpire's decision comes after the idea that the umpire is impartial. In this case the umpire is one of the main

protagonists. Likewise "The Crown can do no wrong" is only permissible when it is balanced by the admission that people on behalf of the Crown *can* do wrong "The Queen can do no wrong; her ministers can do wrong" and that includes the Prime Minister, the Lord Chancellor and the Ecclesiastical Patronage Secretary.

The Bishop also says "I regret and deplore the readiness of many Church people . . . stimulated in some cases by hasty and ill-considered comment in public organs of expression—to believe that these events provided a sufficient ground for raising far-reaching questions concerning the relation of Church and State in the country, or the manner and method of high Church appointments". *Of course* they don't provide sufficient ground for *raising* the matter. *We have been raising it for years.* What these events do provide is a chink in the smug armour of the Establishment that "with all its drawbacks, the system works". We can now all see plainly what we suspected before—that it doesn't.

A recent headline in the *Church Times* ran "Elephant for Bishop". We hope that this does not mark a further breakdown in the system of Church appointments.

Letters

FAITH AND ORDER

Dear Sir,

Mr. J. T. Towers, in PRISM for June, thinks that the character in my imaginary dialogue, Ecumeniac, "undermines the true ground of unity" by his doubts about the Apostolic Succession. I may as well confess that on this point I find myself in agreement with Ecumeniac! So I should be glad if Mr. Towers could justify his objection.

Does he think that it can be shown by the historical evidence that the episcopate is "in unbroken sequence from the first Apostles"? The evidence that I have come across, in the New Testament or elsewhere (there is a summary and a bibliography in the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*), suggests that episcopacy ruling the presbyterate emerged *after* the death of the Apostles. In some places (e.g. Asia Minor: see Ignatius) it was pretty soon after, and when he did arise the bishop took over the Apostles' task of leadership. But that doesn't mean that the Apostles handed over their commission directly to bishops. Indeed, there is nothing to suggest that it was a commission they *could* hand over. Of course they could, and did, commission pastors, evangelists, etc., but not "new Apostles", as Mr. Towers thinks bishops are. Perhaps it would help us if he could say what he thinks the old Apostles were. What was their job?

About non-episcopal churches' sacraments being fruitful but invalid. Must we go on using this offensive term "invalid"? Can't we be more constructive and say that we ourselves stick to episcopacy because it is an essential part of the fullness of Catholic order, and can't have unity without it? Such an attitude leaves the present nature of non-episcopal churches to God's judgment. It doesn't really concern us. What concerns us is what we must in conscience insist on in reunion negotiations, and we can define that without using this very hurtful word "invalid". Just think how *we* object when R.C.s talk about our sacraments as invalid!

Yours sincerely,

DAVID L. EDWARDS.

W.C.1.

Dear Sir,

Quite rightly Martin Clark sees that the conflict over the debate on the "Church of Lanka" is over our basic assumptions on the nature of the Church. I wish to meet his two questions from the point of view of those who are Mr. Clark's doctrinal opponents.

When the study has been made of the biblical and historical development of the actual form of the orders of ministers in the Church of God, their number, and the methods by which they were conferred, it remains to ask the theological question of what really happens when the functions of Holy Orders is conferred on a man.

Anglicans of my persuasion hold that special functions in the Church are possible only because they were assumed first by Our Lord Himself in His Incarnation, and that since Our Blessed Lord has taken His own transformed and glorified humanity into heaven at the right hand of the Father the Holy Ghost is able to impart to those, who have first been baptised into the one Christian ceremony of the Death and Resurrection of Christ, the subsequent special functions which pertain to Our Lord's Humanity and can be exercised through us.

One of the functions which Our Lord Jesus Christ exercised was that of "commissioning" to act in His Name. On the view given here, we look also for that function of Our Incarnate Lord among His followers, and so we view an ordination or consecration. There, the bishops are commissioning to special functions within the one economy of Grace, because they are the ones to whom the special CHRISTOLOGICAL function of commissioning is given, in union with the Glorified Christ, by the power of the Holy Spirit.

On this view, further, the concept of "valid" orders or otherwise turns on the question whether the particular functions of Holy Order are consistently sought from those who are themselves ordained within the visible community of the Church to the function of conferring Holy Order. With our limited human perception we are bound to apply empirical and historical tests of validity, of a kind that are consistent with the theology of ordination. This has been true ever since it was questioned whether Marcionite orders could be accepted, and we must ask these questions, in faithfulness to Our Lord.

To Mr. Clark's third question, then, an unambiguous answer. A Free Churchman belongs to the one Catholic Church by virtue of his Baptism, if he be duly baptised. But that is all. The peculiar

structure of his denomination cannot be regarded as part of the Christian economy, but rather as an ad hoc arrangement by a section of Christians who have rejected those parts of the Catholic economy of Grace which they have attempted to replace by human devices. A "Methodist" is Christian but not "Methodism".

To Mr. Clark's second question it may be replied that for those who regard the Church as a one indivisible economy of Grace in union with the Ascended Lord it can have no intelligible meaning to separate such functions as conferring of episcopal order, and to ask whether these functions exist, in isolation from other functions, within schismatic groups. We regard our position as Anglicans as being tenable only because we believe that corporately, in our sacramental life, we have never been truly divided from the Church of Rome, but that the schism is a purely administrative and in origin, political one. Many of us look for corporate reconciliation by conditional ordination. Let the "Free Churches" seek reconciliation with the Church of Rome, alongside us. Is it not arrogant of Anglicans to think of themselves as being the centre of Christianity? That seems to be the assumption of the Lanka scheme.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN G. LOVEJOY

Newcastle

Dear Sir,

In connection with the letter "Reunion with Rome" (Yves Dubois, PRISM, June 1961) the core of the matter is the question of what is meant by "The Church". The words "the Body of Christ" have three meanings:

1. The human Body with which Our Lord was born from the womb of His mother,
2. His Body present in the tabernacle on the altar in the Blessed Sacrament, and
3. The Church, His Mystical Body.

These are listed in increasing order of difficulty, 1. is an historically verifiable fact, 2. is perceptible only to the eyes of faith, "Animosa firmat fides, praeter rerum ordinem" (Lauda Sion . . . Sequence, Feast of Corpus Christi,) and 3. is the most difficult of all, and yet we know that it is true from the teaching of the New Testament (especially St. Paul) and from the teaching of the Church throughout the ages. This third use of "The Body of Christ is what Roman

Catholics mean by "the Church". This is *not* the same as "Catholic Faith and Order" as defined in paragraph 6 of Yves Dubois' letter. The Catholic creeds were formulated *by* the Church, the Sacraments usually (but not always, e.g. Baptism) come to us *through* the Church, and the episcopate is present *in* the Church, but these three things do not make the Church what she is, the living presence of Our Lord among men.

The letter asks, "Can narrow legalism apply to real life?" and surely Our Lord Himself said in his treatment of the scribes and pharisees that the answer emphatically is "*No*". And the life of a Christian should not be a narrow, legalistic and *negative* "avoidance of mortal sin" but rather the *positive* "life in Christ" so that he can say with St. Paul, "I live, and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me." The "narrow legalism" is rather to be found in the whole attitude of mind which is behind paragraph 4 of that same letter. The concept of any particular doctrine as being "necessary for salvation" is uncharitably restrictive. Can a Buddhist who has never heard of any of the doctrines of Christianity be saved?—Yes, from the Church's constant teaching on this matter, and Our Lord's claim that He has sheep of other folds. Therefore *no one* doctrine is strictly "necessary for salvation". Can anyone who has heard the teachings of the Church and deliberately rejects God's gift of faith be saved? —No (commonly considered to be the case, though they are in much better hands than ours). The Church has always taught that, for salvation, Baptism is essential; e.g. St. Peter in Acts 2:37-8. By Baptism one is made a member of the Mystical Body of Christ, and hence the saying "extra ecclesiam nulla salus". For those baptised as infants and who have attained the age of reason, or for those baptised as adults a certain minimum belief is necessary. This belief "necessary for salvation" is not a long list of questions and answers but is very simple, and it is best expressed in the story of St. Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch in Acts 8:26-39. "See here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptised? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." That is all that is required, for that is what Christianity is about. If one *really* accepts that all the rest of the content of the faith of Catholics follows automatically. If that Aramaic Jew of the first century is really, despite appearances, also God then all that He did and said is important; and one of the things He did was to beget the Church,

His own Mystical Body, when the soldier slashed His side with the spear and "forthwith came there out blood and water".

It is therefore in this that "Romans" and "Anglicans" differ, that "Romans" believe that Our Lord founded a "*Church*" (One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic) and this, being amongst men, is something visible and concrete; whereas Anglicans and Protestants do *not* believe in *the* Church in this way. Once Anglicans realise that this and not contraceptives, or the Assumption of Our Lady, or the Immaculate Conception, or Papal Infallibility, or . . . or . . . is *the* thing preventing what is referred to in the letter as "Reunion" then a lot will have been gained for it is only by discovering what the problem is that one can hope to find the answer to it.

Our Lord *prayed* (He did *not* command) "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me", Jn. 17:21. And yet God will not force men to love Him or to follow Him, He stands *outside* and knocks on the door, but there is no handle on His side of the door because He wills that men should be free to follow Him or not to follow Him. He will force no one to realise that *the* Church is "The Mystical Body of Christ". He just shows us the mangled Body of the Saviour on the cross and pleads with us.

A. P. Cracknell.

Pembroke College, Cambridge.

Dear Sir,

Mr. Fletcher's remarks on reunion were pleasant and charitable, but they really will not do. The Anglican Communion has never regarded itself as perfect, or as constituting the whole Church. Any part of a whole which is cut off from the rest must thereby suffer a loss of completeness. So we may concede that, when the opportunity for reunion comes, it will be right that Anglicans should be ready to receive (as well as to administer) a laying on of hands from their hitherto separated brethren (not only Roman Catholic and Orthodox, but also Protestant) for the fulness and perfection of their ministry. The creation of the new Church of Lanka will, I believe, show Anglicans willing to undergo such a process, And though I do not for one moment doubt the validity of present Anglican orders, still I am certain that by such action those orders

will be enriched and augmented by the grace which is in those parts of the Church from which she is now divided.

But none of this can affect a fact which, as Anglicans, we also know to be true—namely, that we are already a part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church—a Church whose visible and hierarchic unity can be rent by the sin of man, but whose essential unity can never be destroyed, because it is a unity in the one Christ. And because, as we admit in our own case, those parts of the Church which are cut off from their brethren thereby suffer a loss of fulness, then we must insist that those brethren who are cut off from us (however rich they may be in treasures of the faith) have suffered the loss of that part of the fulness of the Catholic Church which is (by God's grace) in us, and ours to give.

And here is the rub. Is Rome prepared to accept a laying on of hands at the hand of Protestant, Orthodox and Anglican, for the making up of those things wherein she has been defective because of her division from us? If not, then she is asking us to agree that we, and those Protestant and Orthodox parts of the Church (for such we believe them to be) with whom we are entering into relationships, are no true parts of the Church at all—for how can they be if they have nothing to give to the Church's fulness? She is asking us to deny what we very well know to be true about the action of the Holy Spirit within ourselves, and to uphold what we know to be false; and that, under pain of the judgment of God, we cannot do—not even for unity. Can Rome confess that she may have something, however slight, to receive, as well as inestimable treasure to give? or (the other side of the same coin) can she confess that Christian division is sin, and that she has had a part in that sin. Mr. Fletcher implies, rightly, that reunion demands sacrifice and humiliation; is his Church prepared to make that sacrifice—the sacrifice which she asks of us? At the moment, there is little sign that she is. Will Rome *ever* make such a sacrifice? I think she might. I have, oddly enough, great faith in the Roman Church; and I believe that she has within her, under God, the holiness for such a sacrifice. This generation provides her with the chance to make it. Indeed, it may be her last.

Here then, I believe, is the real sacrifice demanded of Rome—the confession of imperfection. The other sacrifices which Mr. Fletcher offers may be real sacrifices for him and I respect and give thanks for the spirit in which he offers them. But I must point out

that they are not, from the point of view of his Church, sacrifices at all. Rome has never denied that there can be more than one way of celebrating the Mass, as the "Uniate" Christians clearly demonstrate; and as for Bishops nominated by the Crown—even if that were required (and only two Provinces of the Anglican Communion would require it) every schoolboy knows that there was ample precedent for this in England centuries before the Reformation.

CHRISTOPHER BRYAN.

Reigate.

CORRECTION

Dear Sir,

I am sorry to write again about the cartoon, but may I correct a mistake (yours or mine) in my letter in the June PRISM? One sentence should read: "The uninstructed and intelligent were scornful!" It would be presumptuous of me to suggest that my uninstructed friends are unintelligent.

Yours faithfully,

GLADYS ANDERSON.

W.C.1.

MAN AND SOCIETY

Dear Sir,

The fundamental nature of the questions raised in the June issue on Christian Sociology was a pleasure to see; it was unfortunate that Eugene Rolfe's "instant" solutions could not maintain the standard. It is sometimes hard to accept that depth psychology is no substitute for deep thought, it may also be questioned whether a stockbroker and his wife who "join hands in working in the garden" are any closer to God or their neighbours than the far more numerous families who live in shared houses or flats and co-operate in the use of the joint facilities. There is no place for pious platitudes about "tending the garden of the human personality", work is for most people a labour. Juvenile crime, I might add is not in itself an accurate index of anything; it is not a social scientist who will use "delinquency", "destructiveness" and "juvenile crime" as interchangeable words.

Has Christian social theory nothing to say about wage-earner's insecurity, guaranteed wages, agreed redundancy payments, the

freedom of the individual to change employment without losing pension rights or even the mortgage on his house? No, the writer of the article found the great contribution was "the team", a "psychological derivative of the family". Of course it is possible that the absentee may be the group-family's unwanted child, it is just as possible that a rugby team like the trainer's sponge because he is a mother figure and it is like a return to the breast—but where does that get us?

So the answer lies in "the group" which may at any time become the vehicle of a sacrament. I would only add some comments of an American, W. W. Rostow, who compared the pre-war American puritan with his individualism, thrift, respectability, self-denial and sexual constraint with the post-war American. Similar to Reisman's "inner directed" and "outer directed" members of society Rostow finds the post-war American to be; suspicious of solitary values and relativistic in his moral attitudes; morality is what the group thinks is right and he adopts group harmony as the ultimate goal. This appears to be a far more dangerous position for the Christian, who is usually an isolate from the group norms, adopting some position in which self-interest is not the main criterion, and in order to satisfy the demands for group harmony he must sacrifice his personal principles.

The position of the Christian in an acquisitive and competitive society is a delicate one but it is not solved by papering over the cracks into "togetherness" or pretending that "cultivating" an herbaceous border will ever bring anyone face to face with the living God.

Yours sincerely,

NEIL LEIGHTON.

Epping.

H-BOMB

Dear Sir,

I am sorry to rear my ugly head again. But why oh why do worthies like Dr. Stopford *still* assume (after three years of "thought and prayer" on the subject) that opponents of H-Bombs oppose H-Bombs because "fear of sudden death terrifies them into compromising with evil"? It is fear of God that deters us, i.e. of inflicting not merely the comparative mercy of sudden death, but agonising suffering and diabolical misery upon Christ's "little ones" (ordinary folk),

because the silly old Herods at the top dislike each other's politics. Why does Dr. S. fear Communism? People still appear to be free to be Christians in Russia and China or are they all humbugs; (and why be a humbug at the cost of mockery?). I know of no political system stronger than the gates of hell, and I always understood that these had been burst open. And in loyalty to Him who did it, I would *rather* die than throw an H-bomb at anyone, however many they throw at me or my children, for "Inasmuch . . ."

Yours sincerely,

ERIC HAMMOND.

Chipping Campden.

GUILDFORD

Dear Sir,

"R.D. writes" in June PRISM, of the appointment to Guildford Cathedral, that "We—the church people at large—are perfectly adult and entitled over a matter like this to the truth". This is an unseemly statement and a *non sequitur;* while it would cause no surprise if it appeared in the pseudo-editorial snippets of one of the rabble-rousing newspapers, it must have caused considerable eyebrow-raising amongst PRISM-readers. *The truth* about all appointments is confidential, except for those of representatives of the people chosen by public election (and, Lord save us, just look at the kind of people who get into office in that way). A dean is not a representative of church people at large; he is appointed to administer a cathedral and to be doyen of the diocesan clergy.

It is scandalous that any dean should be appointed by anyone except the bishop of the diocese, but church people whether at large or constrained are not entitled to know the grounds on which he chooses his man. Our foundation documents, which are not in any Act of Parliament or Annexure, but in the New Testament, are silent about the democratic rights of ordinary church people, though they have something to say about being meek, obeying bishops, and the reversal in the Church of the world's notion of places of authority.

Yours faithfully,

G. C. DARTON.

Pinner.

Dear Sir,

May I say two things in final answer to Fr. Hughes? First, I'm sorry he thinks so badly of me that he supposes I would refer to the Passion of our Lord for the sake of a striking phrase. When I spoke of the paralysis of the Cross I spoke of what I, of what we all, I hope, believe to be an inevitable part of Christian experience, the sharing of Christ's patient obedience. Of course we believe that his willingness to be so paralysed released on us the energy of Easter and Pentecost but Good Friday comes first.

Second, the priestly vocation is to minister to Christ's people. There is room for a discussion of how that ministry may be made most effective, none for the implication that those who work in the parish machine are not fulfilling their vocation.

Yours truly,

VALERIE PITT.

S.E.26.

(*This correspondence is now closed.—Ed.*)

Some Sayings of Fr. Raymond Raynes, C.R.

When asked, "And how would you approach the drink problem, Father Raynes?"—With a corkscrew.

Christianity based on the best traits of the English character is exactly wrong.

It is barely possible to combine the activities of being a good Christian and a good Bishop.

The Church of England is an ingeniously devised instrumentality for defeating the objects it is meant to promote.

from "The Life of Raymond Raynes", by Nicholas Mosley. Faith Press. 25s.

The book: **BURNING COALS OF FIRE.**
A frank examination of present-day living, contemporary youngsters, and a Church apparently outmoded and irrelevant. A book to shock and to stimulate.

The author: **VIOLET WELTON,** who has spent 25 years working among young people, both in England and on the Continent. She has no illusions about the desperate state of vast numbers of young people growing up amid the industries and housing estates of Western Europe, insecure, rootless, impatient of a decaying parental authority, with little hope of the future, and a conviction that Christianity is dull and pointless.

If you are a teacher, a parent, a youth leader, or simply a responsible Christian

YOU MUST READ THIS BOOK

A SERAPH BOOK

5s.

S·P·C·K

July Reading

Anglican Devotion

C. J. STRANKS

Archdeacon of Auckland

The book takes us from the Reformation to the Oxford Movement showing the variety but also the common tradition of the writers to whom Englishmen turned as masters in the school of prayer and Christian behaviour. It examines famous figures such as Taylor, Traherne, Law, Wilberforce, Keble and many other Anglican teachers. 30s net

The British Churches Today

KENNETH SLACK

General Secretary of the British Council of Churches

A book about the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Roman Catholic Church, the Free Churches and other Protestant bodies—as they exist in Britain *today*. An *SCM Paperback*. 5s net

When Israel Came Out of Egypt

GABRIEL HEBERT

'The preparation of this book has been for me a work of absorbing interest', Father Hebert writes, 'partly because the Exodus lies at the base of the faith of the Old Testament, and its theme of a mighty deliverance carries on into the Church's Easter, and partly for the historical study. We must deal seriously and honestly with the history.' 8s 6d net

new paperback editions of two biographies

Mother of Carmel

A Portrait of St Teresa of Jesus

Spirit of Flame

A Study of St John of the Cross

E. ALLISON PEERS

7s 6d net each

SCM PRESS

Poetry

MARTHA AND MARY

Martha and Mary were sisters.
It was Martha cleaned the sink,
And handed the Living Water round,
That Mary knelt to drink.

Martha attended the cooking,
And Martha polished the floor
Where Mary sat at the Master's feet,
To listen and adore.

For Mary, the Sphere's sweet music,
While Martha practised her scales;
And Martha toiled in the vineyard's heat,
For Mary's Holy Grails.

The Bread of Heaven for Mary,
That Martha set to rise.
But it nurtured both, it was food indeed,
And hallowed in their eyes.

The Fires that kindled in Mary,
Though Martha carried the coals,
And leaded the grate and laid and lit,
It cherished both their souls.

Martha and Mary were sisters.
I hold it we have the growth
Of each in the hearts of all of us,
Because He loved them both.

K. CONNOLLY.

HOLY HOLY HOLY

Look reverently upon the vine,
The grape conceals the chaliced wine.

Walk through the corn with hallowed feet,
The wafer lies within the wheat.

And tread the woodland quietly,
The Cross is in the living tree.

K. CONNOLLY.

SERMONS IN LEAVES

I praise thee, O God,
Watching Spring's vast green smile,
And am almost, on today's showing,
Inclined to acknowledge thee to exist and be the Lord.
Those rich, dense chestnut cumuli, for instance,
Deeper down-driven by their candles' weight.
Trees of all kinds, whose winter skeletons
Birds have not ceased to haunt, like lively leafless fruit:
Those that in gardens fountain, ignoring oblong walls,
Binding the earth on which we stand, the world in which we move
Into a tenement-ruled space, two planes
Edge from each side, and as their leaves' life grows
They seem to strain across like parted things,
Advancing correspondent jig-saw parts.
Sometimes they look two lonely lands
Split by a quake, sundered by quick-in-sea
(Whose colour varies with the sky's decisions).
A backwater cool I know, and long to see once more,
Shadowed and shallowed by the leaves
Of stalactitically loving limes.
For such reasons do I feel an urge
To praise . . . thee, O God?

DAVID MITCHELL.

HUSBAND AND WIFE: A WALK IN THE PARK

Under these trees from which the leaves are flying,
Whose sodden trunks are black as coal,
Move I with her for whom my heart is crying,
Linked through our hands and talk as on we stroll.

Proud as Lucifer, grateful as dying thief,
I look upon her face, her face,
Feeling my heart flare, fire up with awe and grief,
For all my malice sunk there without trace.

Upward she smiles, tender, terrible as Spring,
Closer I crook her, kiss her eyes.
Miracled mid Sunday kites, a random thing,
Let out of prison while God's own son dies.

DAVID MITCHELL.

PIT SHAFT VISIT

As I descended into blackness
With the whirring pit-winder
And the creaking cage, into the strangeness,
Strange to me, of this heritage,
May I, though not of their rule and order,
To them an uncut page
In an unread book, yet walk among brethren;
May I find myself atoned to them,
From interior walls of rare
And sequestered light and shadow
Atoned to George, Eddy, Arthur,
In the secret they cherish here,
In the commonalty that reigns here:
In the forgiveness atoned to them
As I put on their dress, their duress,
For a day, an hour, in a brave show,
A parody of incarnation. May the parody
Be not a parody in their humanity
As round me gather the lineaments of a dearth
Deeper and darker, and of that skipper
Who charts and courses its shorelessness,
Who moulds its formlessness into a mast
With billowing sail and all aboard:
Paradisal navigator where the earth
Receives her bridegroom at last,
Where Mary knows her Lord.

FRANK BUCHANAN

UCKFIELD CHURCHYARD

So quiet it is, away from the lights and the traffic,
Only the glimmer of stars in the yew's black feathers,
Only the night-wind stirring the arms of the cedar.

Who knows how long the trees have stood in the churchyard,
Rooted in graves, reaching for wind and starlight,
Reaching from dark death to the life and the splendour.

Rooted in death, but death is itself fleeting,
Corruption eats itself out and moulders to cleanness,
But the wind and the stars are safe from mortality's fingers.

And the timeless stars, and the wind changeable—constant
Themselves are the darkling root of a greater glory
Alive and splendid beyond knowing or seeing.

HELEN GRUNDY.

PRAYERS

I

I am afraid
For fear I should lose You.
I am not strong enough
To keep myself by You;
But You are strong enough
To hold me.
Do not let me go.

II

All things are Yours;
You made them,
Set them evolving slowly down all time.
The very mud and rocks are in Your hands;
The emptiness of outer space
Is full of You.
The turning galaxies
Move by Your touch.
Yours are creation and redemption.
Yours is the cross, the rising from the dead.
Yours is the hand that holds me.
Let all things praise You;
Let my heart praise You, Lord.

MYRA KENDRICK.

Reviews

SPIRITUAL THERAPY, by *Richard K. Young* and *Albert L. Meiburg*. Hodder & Stoughton, pp. 192. 15s.

The division between psyche and soma may be useful and necessary, but it is important to remember that it is a theoretical construct and does not apply to actual human beings.

In the endeavour to find a unifying standpoint it is possible to invoke the idea of the spiritual and see how this works out in practice. That would seem to be the basis of this readable and authentic book about pastoral and counselling work in hospital. All the chapters have been checked for the medical accuracy and at the end of each chapter are short lists of references to further readings of the medical literature. It deals with the treatment of a number of common psycho-somatic disorders such as asthma, migraine and ulcerative colitis. Further chapters cover heart disease, childbirth and acute grief reactions. The examples of actual cases are clear and interesting but cases where the approach and treatment fail are sometimes as useful as the record of success and they may help the newcomer to have more realistic expectations. The book shows how fruitful collaboration can take place between physician, psychiatrist and pastor, and how such work can benefit the patient. While working in the hospital service in England I have never seen such co-operative effort and can imagine few physicians or surgeons who would call in the pastor to work with them. They are still reluctant, in many cases, to work with their medical colleagues, the psychiatrists.

But it would seem important that the minister should not allow himself to be overawed by the exaggerated power and prestige of the physician or surgeon; there is no need for him to be over-respectful or submissive.

I think it is here that such a book as this is useful, for in a short and readable form it conveys a lot of information about some common diseases and their treatment. Armed with greater knowledge the pastor can visit the wards as a much more effective and confident figure. There is a particularly good chapter on reactions to acute bereavements, and the authors refer to Freud's paper on Mourning and Melancholia. This discusses aspects of normal grief

reactions, and this is related to material in the book with some good observations about crying and the interviewer's response to it. The authors note the value of the family as a support to the grief-stricken member and also the positive function of mourning rituals and ceremonies.

It is in this area of death, where medical treatment has failed, that the priest should be able to come into his own and exercise a potent and numinous ministry. Doctors and nurses tend to react to a patient's death by the mechanism of dissociation, so that they can carry on their duties without the further exhaustion of emotional involvement. In any case, the current scientific mythology gives the doctor little constructive to say to the dying patient or the mourning relative. But the priest or pastor should be more at home in this terrifying frontier region; it may be his courage and vigilance which go to the avoiding of the not unknown occurrence of a patient dying alone, in the day-time, in the ward of a busy and sophisticated hospital.

I think this book is short enough to be recommended to the over-worked theological student. The burdens of hospital visiting and listening to patients are more easily and creatively borne if there is understanding not only of the surface happenings, but also of the undercurrents of fear, hostility and despair which are so often concealed with such self-defeating success.

W. H. ALLCHIN.

LIFE, DEATH AND THE LAW, by *Norman St. John-Stevas*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 35s.

Not many young Christian lawyers can hope to find their latest book receiving honourable mention in *The Times*' first leader, when sent for review, and it is a mark of Dr. Stevas' concern with the right questions as well as his hard work that he so impressed Printing House Square.

"Life, Death and the Law" sounds like the title of a good detective novel, but in fact it is an examination of the very difficult problems that arise when Christian doctrines about the nature and value of human life are applied to the legal control of contraceptives, artificial insemination, sterilisation, homo-sexual practices, suicide and euthanasia. In its most formative period, English law was believed

to be Christian law for a Christian state, and even now Judaeo-Christian moral values inform most of our legislation and precedents. However, in these particular subjects, different Christian and moral traditions take opposing views, and the resultant uncertainty makes the perennial question of the relationship which ought to exist between law and morality even more perplexing.

Dr. Stevas will not satisfy the philosophers with his long opening chapter, but he does give a useful review of recent contributions by jurists to the debate. Much more valuable is the great mass of information in the succeeding pages, and the appendices, enriched by copious footnotes, which make the book an essential reference for anyone who is impatient with one-sided propagandist pamphlets.

In part this book is a badly-needed answer to the apparently atheistic treatment of the same subjects by Dr. Glanville-Williams in "The Sanctity of Life and the Criminal Law", Thus Dr. Stevas cites some good points in not agreeing with him and Julian Huxley that A.I.D., if legalised, would produce the beneficial result that man and woman might consummate the sexual function with those they love, but fulfil the reproductive function with those whom on perhaps other grounds they admire. The legal detachment and precision of the writing makes a welcome change, and its inconclusiveness is appropriate.

PETER COLEMAN.

SEX AND THE CHRISTIAN, by *Reginald F. Trevett*. Burns & Oates, 8s. 6d.

Family Planning enjoys the rather vague, but reasonably benign, approval of the Lambeth Conference. It would be a good thing for people, particularly in places like India, where the population urgently needs limiting. But there seems to be little attempt to approach the subject with a positive theological attitude. Why? Is it because the official view of contraception is phrased permissively, so that, however absolute the permission, it leaves those who use the permission with a feeling of being at a disadvantage? Or is it because the Roman Catholics are so vocal against it that no one quite dares to be too enthusiastic in opposition to them, in case it really is wrong? Or is there a proper diffidence at too outspoken a discussion of such a personal and delicate matter? This last must be respected, and the bishops were probably exercising such

respect. But because there is, on the one hand, a calculated attack on contraception and, on the other, perhaps a too casual and automatic use of it, we ought to think theologically about the implications of Anglican doctrine.

Let us begin by considering the Roman Catholic rejection of contraception, since they are likely to express it most clearly. They do not base their case on what marriage is for. They say that the chief end of marriage is the procreation of children (with which no one disagrees, though they tend to imply that one does), then they go on to admit that what they call "mutual aid" is also a legitimate end, so as to cover the practice of intercourse when conception is unlikely or impossible, and to justify the use of what is popularly known as the Safe Period (of which more later).

Their case for rejecting contraception in any circumstances is stated in this book on page 106: "It sets up an *artificial* barrier . . . between the partners" (his italics). It is difficult to see what force—other than as mere emotional ballast—he intends the word "artificial" to have. Any barrier would impair the completeness of the act. If he means the actual artefact, or means used, some are worse than others, but presumably oral contraceptives will be allowed. The question hinges on what constitutes a barrier between the partners, but the issue is confused by the Roman Catholic attitude to suffering.

Their line about the whole situation is to equate the effort of abstinence from intercourse (and the effort of having too many children, as well) with the "suffering" to which all Christians are called.

(One is reminded of the extreme low church confusion: that "I am not ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified" means that one should glory in a kind of spiritual exposing of oneself. It is a misunderstanding of the shame of the faith, and perverts many. The same sort of thing applies to the Roman Catholic doctrine of suffering.)

They spotlight the wrong part and distort the effect of the whole: they emphasise the personal aspect, almost enlist pride to support the ego in its effort at self-suppression. Where self oblation becomes too deliberate it has an effect opposite to that intended. There has to be a delicacy and humour about the genuine act. If De Caussade were not so intense, his doctrine of self-abandonment to the Divine Providence would be more accurate than most. "The sacrament

of the present moment" is a great insight into the theology of acceptance. Here and now, this.

The grace of marriage is grounded in acceptance—acceptance of each other, acceptance of the children, or inability to have children, acceptance of the circumstances within which the marriage must grow. Intercourse is the great act of acceptance which expresses all the others, and at the same time makes all the other acceptances possible (saving, always, those brilliant exceptions which function on one lung, as it were). It is the substance, together with the vows expressing the intention, of the sacrament of matrimony, under God the source of power, the means of grace.

The question about contraception is whether it prevents proper intercourse. Leaving aside those unfortunate people who have in any case an unhealthy distaste for sex, there is no reason why contraception should prove any more of a barrier than, say, false teeth. It is in fact a matter for common acceptance, and therefore potentially unifying. The circumstances of the marriage and family having been responsibly considered, the choice of contraception is an act of faith in the sacrament.

The so-called Safe Period is said to be a preferable method of avoiding conception because it is claimed to be natural. To begin with, on the basis of their argument, it is the most unnatural time in the month for a woman to have intercourse, since the most natural time would be when she was *most* likely to conceive.

Secondly, it is notoriously unnatural and artificial to be bound to have intercourse at a set time. Of course, one is free not to, but there must be a certain feeling of pressure—"If we don't now, we shall have to wait until next time, or take a risk"—and so a feeling of mutual obligation and concern in case the other one should have too much to bear. This may sound very beautiful and unselfish, and just the sort of sentiment that ought to be stimulated; but if there is always a gap between one's feelings and one's expression of them, how can one make real contact with the other person?

Thirdly, if one is using the Safe Period responsibly, presumably it would not be right to have another child at this time, and it is at least arguable that the fear of pregnancy is present in those acts, setting up a barrier and preventing proper intercourse far more effectively than contraception by other means. This last point has, of course, been made before, but the positive aspect has not, I think, been sufficiently emphasised. Efficient contraception, far from

preventing proper intercourse, can in fact, in this way also, be a means of attaining it.

The terrible picture drawn by Reginald Trevett of what he calls "the contraceptive couple" is so ludicrously far from reality that it becomes tragic evidence of that state of mind that can believe it. He visualises the couple shutting themselves away from their neighbours and indulging in private orgies, unlimited by "natural restraints". Even if he is speaking metaphorically, he is talking nonsense, as there is a quite extraordinary element of intercession in intercourse—"To work is to pray". His picture suggests that the Roman Catholic may be rather preoccupied with sex, since he does not seem able to imagine the possibility of moderation apart from his "natural restraints".

The same author speaks of "the great movements of physical desire which sweep across the soul" (p. 37), meaning temptations to adultery. He seems so keyed up, so humourless about it. The attitude of Charles Williams to the problem is an illuminating contrast—physical desire is not a false god to be feverishly resisted, in a sense it is not a temptation at all, but an insight into the excellence that another person could be, and so a hint of the Beatific Vision; though of course it has to be gently by-passed, as it were, until all relationships find their fulfillment in the final relationship to the Trinity.

The point is that, with the help of contraceptives, sex can take its proper healthy place in life. There is no longer any need to fear it, or challenge and fight it as an enemy. One doesn't have to keep thinking about it all the time. We pray "lead us not into temptation". If we mean it, we ought not to reject means of avoiding temptation. Sex should not be a "major problem" a "noble struggle", for married people, or where is the force of that other end of marriage—"for the avoidance of fornication"?

Here, perhaps, is the real answer to the question we started with—because we are able to use what can truly be called a means of grace, the exclusive tyranny of sex is overthrown. Curious heresy and paradox as it may sound, there is a sense in which sex doesn't matter any more. Sex is swallowed up in victory. O sex where is thy sting? O bed where is thy victory?

ELIZABETH DUPRE.

Prayer (6)
Members One of Another

Sister Edna Mary, C.S.A.

In certain circumstances a Christian may be lonely, but he can never be solitary and still be true to his Christian profession.

To try to live in physical isolation is to ignore the natural unity of the human race, of which our demonstrable cultural and economic interdependence is only one example. To try to live in spiritual isolation is equally to ignore the supernatural unity of the human race, without which the Incarnation could be only an isolated act with at most an emotive effect on other men, instead of being (as the Christian holds) the act by which God united humanity to himself and brought about a new relationship with himself for every member of the human race; and further it is to ignore the way in which God has made this new relationship available to human beings through an entity so closely articulated that the only language adequate to describe it is that appropriate to a human body. The Christian recognises that by birth he is a member of that whole human race into which God entered when he became man, and that by baptism he is a member of the divine community through which God continues to achieve his purpose for the human race; and his membership both of the natural and of the supernatural group involves him in a complex of privileges and responsibilities.

Much has been done in the liturgical developments of the past fifteen years to emphasise that the public worship of the Church is concerned not primarily with the relationship of God to the individual, but of the group and of the individual within the group, and in particular that to join in the Eucharist is not primarily to "make my communion" but to take one's part in the worship which the Body of Christ offers on behalf of the world and to receive the divine life to be used for the world.

But there is also a corporateness about so-called "private prayer". The pagan conception of religion as the "flight of the alone to the Alone" hangs like a thunder-cloud over much Christian devotion, darkening it and obscuring its purpose. For the Christian sees in

God not the Alone but the perfect society of the Holy Trinity whose mutual love overflows to draw men into communion with himself; and the Christian comes to God not alone but joining his prayer to that of the whole Church in heaven and on earth, and bringing with him in his prayers all those who are his fellows by nature or by grace. To see human prayer as a faint reflection of the love of God can put the dreary business of intercession lists into a new perspective. Disciplined and systematic intercession is necessary; but as the circle widens beyond those for whom we have an immediate concern, to take in the sick and those who minister to them, rulers and those in positions of authority, the Church in other lands, and all the other old familiar headings, it can so easily become just a matter of duty, of endless boring lists consuming an increasing amount of time. But they will not be boring if we remember that this is God inviting us to share in his loving purpose for people with whom he is not bored; and they need not consume an increasing amount of time as the circle widens if we remember that prayer, like love, cannot be measured quantitatively. The recognition that there is really no end to the people for whom we should pray will not be a burden but a joyful recognition that there is no end to the love of God, and that if we use prayers in general terms (perhaps the prayer for all sorts and conditions of men, in the Book of Common Prayer) alongside more specific intercessions our co-operation with that love is not limited to those whom we know personally or can describe or even enumerate.

Like other forms of prayer, intercession is not to be limited to times set aside for prayer, but is something for which there are countless opportunities during the day. We all constantly meet people, some of whom we like and some of whom at the natural level we probably dislike, but all of whom we can bring to God in prayer. Waiting in a queue for a bus, walking along a busy street, buying something in a shop, entering an office, sitting down to a meal—all these are opportunities of lifting to God the people we meet and see around us and those who, although unseen, are providing for our needs. It is not a question of a self-conscious "I must remember to pray for them" (although certain self-reminders are necessary at least at first); rather it is that the more our thoughts centre on God and the more we share his love for men, the more naturally we shall bring these two concerns together and gather the people around us up into the spoken prayer or quiet resting with

God which occupies our leisure moments.

The more we look for opportunities to pray for other people the more we shall find them in daily life. Many Christians are familiar with the idea of offering a particular service (usually the Eucharist) to God with special "intention" for a person or a cause; and this can well be extended on occasions to particular acts during the service, making the recitation of the Creed an act of intercession for non-Christians (in general or a specific person), the Sanctus for those who blaspheme God's holy Name, the very act of communion for those who cut themselves off from God, and so on—remembering of course that the attention must be fixed on God and not on the person for whom the prayer is offered. Nor need this practice be limited to acts of worship. Actions, especially those that cost an effort, may be made into prayer for other people. To give one example: the effort to resist a particular temptation can be turned into a prayer for all who are tempted to the same sin—the effort to speak gently instead of in anger can be made a prayer for those whose inability to bridle their anger leads to sins of violence; or one who is prone to gossip can offer to God the effort of restraining his tongue as a prayer for those whose idle talk breaks up homes and causes untold misery, offering it of course is in no spirit of superiority, of success where others fail, but linking it with humble thanksgiving to God for the grace that he gives for the battle. And not only actions can be thus turned into prayer, but also the things, small as well as great, that have to be suffered: if we are depressed at the failure of some cherished enterprise, we can offer that disappointment to God as a prayer perhaps for those many loyal priests who labour faithfully for years without seeing any results; if we are too tired to know how to cope with our day's work, we can offer that weariness as a prayer for missionaries who labour on in the face of overwhelming odds and in weariness or sickness; and when at times God seems far away, we can offer that very sense of deprivation as itself a prayer for those who do not know God at all.

These and many other ways will open up if we really have a will to bring other people to God in our prayers—if the centre of our own lives is our communion with God, so that we share his life and therefore his compassion for all men, whether they recognise him or not. There are many who do not recognise God and his claims upon them, or, if they dimly recognise him, do not know how

to approach him. The praying Christian can express whatever of praise or penitence they dimly apprehend, or offer for them the tribute they do not acknowledge. This is his proudest privilege, and the way in which the layman exercises his priesthood as a member of the Body of Christ.

In her all longings mix and meet;
Dumb souls through her are eloquent;
She feels the world beneath her feet
Thrill with a passionate intent;
Through her our tides of feeling roll
And find their God within her soul.*

These words were written of one with a particular vocation; but the assertion "dumb souls through her are eloquent" should be true of any Christian who takes his faith seriously.

* R. H. Benson "The Teresian Contemplative".

In this connection I would like to quote from a biography (*Pyke*: *The Unknown Genius,* David Lampe) I happened to be reading while I was writing this book. The subject of the biography, Geoffrey Pyke, was an odd, brilliantly clever man with ideas about children which were most unconventional in the twenties. He "used to say that the principle we should follow is to treat every child as a distinguished foreign visitor who knows little or nothing of our language or customs. If we invited a distinguished visitor to tea and he spilled his cup on the best table-cloth or consumed more than his share of cake, we should not unbraid him and send him out of the room. We should hasten to assure him that all was well. One rude remark from the host would drive the visitor from the room, never to be seen again. But we address children constantly in the rudest fashion and yet expect them to behave as models of politeness".

(From *Half Angels* by Elisabeth Montifiore, **Faith Press,** 8*s.* 6*d.*

PRISM PERSONALITY: 8

TIMOTHY BEAUMONT

It must take Tim a very long time to dress in the morning and almost as long to undress at night. It's not just the carnation and the watch chain but the great quantity of useful equipment he hangs about his person—things for spearing cigars, miniature cameras, hidden gadgets for many purposes. It may well be that it was an ancestor of his who invented the thing on the Boy Scout's knife which takes stones from horses' hooves. In any lull in the conversation Tim may be seen wandering amiably about, apparently sniffing at flowers, actually photographing people at high speed. Inside the gadget-strewn torso is a devout and intent priest, who has adopted the most thorough camouflage to conceal his good intentions. And if ever his will-to-power tries to burst through his Christian humility his charming wife Mary Rose is on hand to check it, humorously and bluntly.

It would be difficult to cram more inaccuracies in such a short space but as the Editorial Advisory Board insist, I have put it in. Readers will be glad to know that we have now completed dealing with those intimately connected with PRISM *and that although we will continue producing "personalities", what one reader has referred to as "your nauseating mutual-admiration society" will cease.*—ED.

TIME & TIDE

Did you see TIME & TIDE'S 20 pp. Supplement on the Churches in Britain? Most PRISM readers did. But not all perhaps realise that TIME & TIDE also carries a regular weekly feature, THE WORLD AND THE CHURCH, or that the scope of its religious book reviews is unique for a general weekly.

TIME & TIDE is original, forceful, alive to what is going on in Britain *now*, genuinely independent. It is the new-style news weekly. And it is aware that the Churches are news, just as much as politics, sport, the arts, how people earn their livings, how they are housed, or what they do with their leisure.

This month THE WORLD AND THE CHURCH will include articles by Valerie Pitt, Father Martin Jarrett-Kerr and A Religious of C.S.M.V.

Order TIME & TIDE—the news weekly Church people can't afford to miss—from your newsagent or by direct subscription (£3 per annum; £1 10*s*. for six months) from The Circulation Manager, 32 Bloomsbury Street, W.C.1.

TIME & TIDE

Printed by Oxley & Son (Windsor) Ltd., 4 High Street, Windsor